

ITEM NUMBER: 5c

20/00396/FUL	Extension to block a/b to form additional offices above existing ground floor office.	
Site Address:	Ver House, 55 London Road, Markyate, Hertfordshire	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Soor	
Case Officer:	Robert Freeman	
Parish/Ward:	Markyate Parish Council	Watling
Referral to Committee:	The application has been referred to the Development Management Committee given the contrary recommendation of Markyate Parish Council. The application has also been called in by Councillor Chapman. Councillor Chapman has expressed concerns about the height of the building and the impact on privacy of neighbouring units. Councillor Chapman is also concerned with the access to the site and the impact of development on highways safety.	

1. RECOMMENDATION – That planning permission be GRANTED.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 The proposals would provide additional office space within the village of Markyate of a scale compatible with surrounding residential uses in accordance with Policies CS4, CS12 and CS14 of the Core Strategy.
- 2.2 The buildings are located a significant distance from residential properties in London Road and have been carefully design to avoid harm to residential properties in both London Road and Long Meadow. The increased height to the proposed buildings would not result in any significant loss in either daylight or sunlight to neighbouring land in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.
- 2.3 The controlled use of the site will result in some improvements in terms of noise generation and some alleviation of anti-social behaviour on the site.
- 2.4 The increased office use does not significantly intensify the use of the site and would not give rise to conditions prejudicial to matters of highways safety as set out in the comments of the highway authority. The means of access to the site is therefore considered to be satisfactory in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 51 and 54 and Appendix 4 of the Local Plan and Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 Ver House is located to the rear of properties forming 53-89 London Road, Markyate and comprises a light industrial complex of three buildings and associated parking areas. Blocks A and B comprise single storey premises used for more general commercial purposes including manufacture whilst Block C appears to be a more modern two storey office building. There are a total of 47 designated parking spaces across the site.

- 3.2 The buildings are currently occupied by a range of tenants including Acrovision (suppliers of industrial barcode readers and other automated system products) Service Logic Ltd (repair of electrical and optical equipment) A hard standing yard behind units A and B also appears to have been used for the storage and repair of vehicles and as a scrap yard.
- 3.3 The north western flank elevation of building A abuts the boundary with the residential properties in Long Meadow. There are a number of trees on the northern boundary of the site with the busy A5183 beyond this boundary.
- 3.4 The River Ver enters a culvert at the western site boundary and runs beneath the site.

4. PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The application seeks outline planning permission for the construction of additional floors above the existing commercial premises in blocks A and B for use as office accommodation. A single floor would be added to Block A with two floors being added to Block B. Dormers would be utilised in the roof space to provide additional floor area within the building. Permission is required for access, layout and scale.
- 4.2 The proposals would add approximately 413 m² office space to the site. This is capable of being subdivided into a number of separate premises served by communal stairwells and toilets. The yard at the rear of the building would be set out to provide an additional 19 parking spaces.
- 4.3 The application has been revised since its original submission and additional information has been provided by the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment

5. PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.1 An earlier application (4/03141/18/OUT) for the construction of offices was withdrawn to address issues raised by the Environment Agency in relation to the culverting of the River Ver and activities on the site.

6. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

- 6.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

- 6.2 These are reproduced in full in Appendix B

7. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS4 – The Towns and Large Villages
CS8 – Sustainable Transport
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS13 – Quality of Public Realm
CS14 – Economic Development
CS15 – Offices, Research, Industry, Storage and Distribution
CS26 – Green Infrastructure
CS29 – Sustainable Design and Construction
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS31 – Water Management
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS35 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.

Local Plan

Policy 13 – Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations
Policy 51 – Development and Transport Impacts
Policy 54 – Highway Design
Policy 99 – Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands
Appendix 4 - :Layout and Design of Employment Areas.

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)
Energy Efficiency and Conservation
Water Conservation

8. CONSIDERATIONS

Policy and Principle

- 8.1 Although the application site does not form a designated General Employment Area under the Core Strategy or Saved Local Plan it does perform an important employment role within the village of Markyate and its growth would be encouraged under Policy CS4, CS14 and CS15 of the Core Strategy providing that this is not to the detriment of residential uses.
- 8.2 Policy CS15 specifically provides support for provision for small businesses that may be served by modest sized and flexible office spaces such as those proposed in this application. This may assume additional importance given the current COVID-19 pandemic and the likelihood of different working trends emerging during economic recovery.
- 8.3 The key issues in this case are therefore whether the growth of the employment use would be detrimental to the residential amenities of those residential properties around the perimeter of the application site and whether the access and parking arrangements remain safe and appropriate for the type and nature of development upon the site.
- 8.4 Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy stresses the importance of making safe and accessible sites with appropriate levels of car parking embedded in a Car Parking Standards SPD.
- 8.5 Policies CS11 and CS12 from the Core Strategy and Saved Appendices 3 and 4 of the Local Plan establish how the impact of development upon residential amenity may be considered.

Layout and Design

- 8.6 The application has been submitted as an outline application and as such it is relevant only to consider the access, layout and scale of the proposed building. All other matters (appearance and landscaping) have been reserved. It has been clarified that the height of the building should be considered as per drawing VER.H.M.P.ELEV.R1 dated 01/20. This indicates that a raised eaves level, roof and dormer windows would be provided to building A and an additional floor and converted roof space would be added to building B. This would add approximately 413 square metres of office space.
- 8.7 Drawing VER.H.M.P.ELEV.R1 also provides illustrative elevations of the proposed building. This is considered to be generally acceptable in terms of its design, bulk, scale, height, layout and use of materials in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Core Strategy. These elevations form a sound basis upon which to evolve the overall appearance of building through the reserved matters including the arrangement of fenestration.

Impact on Amenity

Long Meadow

- 8.8 The nearest residential unit to the proposed development is that at 1 Long Meadow immediately to the west of the application site. The impact of the proposed development upon the amenities of this unit is limited.
- 8.9 The alterations to this building result in a lower ridge line than the existing building and the provision of a hipped roof form. Although the eaves line is higher and the internal floor levels have been adjusted to achieve additional office space, the building is not considered to have any significant impact on daylight or sunlight to this property.
- 8.10 A number of dormer windows are shown on the indicative elevation. I would have some concerns in relation to the close proximity of a dormer window serving a stairwell to the western end of Block A and its implications for privacy of 1 Long Meadow. It would be recommended this window is fitted as a non-opening obscure glazed window or removed as details of the appearance of the building are dealt with through reserved matters applications. I am satisfied that the other dormer windows to this building would not provide any direct view into the dwelling or its amenity space and as such would not be considered to be harmful to the residential amenities of this property.

London Road

- 8.11 Ver House is located to the north of London Road and in excess of 40m from the rear elevations to properties thereon. It is also located within the valley of the River Ver and lower than the properties in London Road.
- 8.12 The provision of a two storey building in this location will not result in any impact upon daylight or sunlight to properties in London Road and is significantly in excess of the commensurate residential standards for separation distances. The inclusion of windows at first floor level and at roof level within this building are not considered to be significantly harmful to the privacy of these residential units, in view of the separation distance, topography and nature of intended use.

Access and Parking

- 8.13 The site will continue to be accessed via a road located between residential units at 53 and 57 London Road. This road is approximately 4.5m in width and approximately 35m in length. London Road is generally straight in this location with good visibility of on-coming traffic to the west of the access. There are however parking bays located to the south east of the access providing on-street parking for residential properties.
- 8.14 The scale of the proposed office development has been dramatically reduced since the original comments from the highway authority from the 853m² identified in their response to approximately 756 m² (Gross External Floor Area) This scale of office development is considered unlikely to generate significant vehicle movements in addition to those currently being undertaken from the site and in the opinion of the highway authority would not significantly prejudice matters of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies 51 and 54 of the Local Plan 1991-2011
- 8.15 An additional 19 parking spaces would be allocated as a result of this development and this would represent a shortfall of 2-3 spaces against the standards in the Car Parking Standards SPD (based on 1 space per 35m²). This is not considered to be significant in this case noting the location of bus stops outside 69 London Road and the Plume and Feathers Public House a short walking distance (less than 200m) from the site
- 8.16 It is noted that the current office accommodation has an over provision of spaces against the adopted standards and that overall the site would still provide an over provision in parking spaces of some 7 spaces for the scale of office development within this commercial area.
- 8.17 The applicant should submit further details of EV charging points through a planning condition.

Representations

Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour

- 8.18 The current use of the site does not appear to be regulated leading to its use by business premises till late at night and occasional instances of crime and anti-social behaviour. Lights have been installed to buildings A and B in the interests of security, although their siting appears to have been a nuisance to residential properties in London Road. A number of residents have expressed concerns that the proposals will intensify the use of the site and exacerbate these problems.
- 8.19 The proposals seek to introduce offices, formerly a Class B1 land use and now included in Schedule 2 Part A (Commercial, Business and Services) Class E of the Use Classes Order. These uses extend to commercial uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, soot, ash, dust or grit and as such should, by definition, not result in any significant harm to residential amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 8.20 The proposals are seen as beneficial, in that they would remove the current yard area from the rear of buildings A and B in favour of additional parking for the office use. A number of complaints refer directly to noise from this activity as being detrimental to residential amenity, particularly where this occurs at weekends.
- 8.21 The use of planning conditions can further control the hours of use of the offices in the interests of residential amenities, whilst conditions on the external lighting and means for security of the site are also considered to be reasonable given the nature of the proposals

and the requirements to prevent or discourage crime under the NPPF and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

Flooding and Drainage

- 8.22 There has been a significant delay in the processing of this application to allow the applicants to address concerns raised by the Environment Agency to the continued development of the site, including the culverting of the River Ver and unpermitted activities within the protected area of the watercourse and the impact of the proposals on flood risk. The uses of the site include the use of land to the rear of buildings A and B associated with scrap and car repairs including works associated with motor sport (as referred to in the objection from 65 London Road)
- 8.23 The site is identified as falling within Zone 3 (high risk) however the proposals are for a less vulnerable form of development and would not increase either the footprint of the building nor hard standing. The Environment Agency has removed their objection on the basis of additional information provided in relation to flooding and the stability and integrity of the culverted section of the Ver underneath the site. There is no objection to the use of the area of hard standing above the culvert as a parking area, nor is it considered that the construction of additional office space above building A and B give rise to conditions that would increase the risk of flooding either on the site or in neighbouring land.

Need

- 8.24 A number of representations have raised concerns with the demand for office space in the locality given the loss of other areas of employment in the village and given a high vacancy rate in existing office premises within the village. They are concerned that further applications will be submitted for residential use of the site. It is not prudent for the local planning authority to question the need for office space given that it is appropriate in the locality nor is this material to the consideration of this case.
- 8.25 Any application for residential use of the site will need to be judged on its own merits.

Noise and Pollution

- 8.26 Paragraph 8.19 clarifies that office uses should not normally give rise to conditions prejudicial to residential amenities of neighbouring properties, whilst paragraph 8.21 above also proposes mitigation measures against nuisance associated with use of the premises. The use of the building as offices should not significantly increase the noise nuisance associated with the site and is unlikely in my opinion to exceed the background noise levels associated with the use of the A5138. The proposed building is also likely to include sound insulation to prevent noise being a concern to future occupants and to mitigate noise arising from the use of the building. For these reasons, it would be concluded that there are no grounds to refuse the application based on the noise and pollution concerns of neighbouring units.

Trees

- 8.27 The proposals do not affect the trees located along the rear boundary of the site in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan 1991-2011

Other Material Considerations

- 8.28 The proposals are not accompanied by any Sustainability Statement in accordance with Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy. The absence of this statement does not prevent the determination of the proposals although it would be useful to understand how the works to the buildings would contribute to the aims and objectives of this policy and meet the requirements of the Energy Efficiency SPD and Water Conservation SPD. The fabric of the building is likely to be improved as a result of development thereby improving the energy efficiency of the properties. As mentioned above, there is also an opportunity to provide EV charging facilities on the site in accordance with the Car Parking Standards SPD

Conditions

- 8.29 The application is submitted as an outline proposal and as such a number of conditions are required in relation to the timing and content of reserved matters applications.
- 8.30 In addition further details in relation to exterior lighting, crime prevention measures, arrangements for EV charging points and sustainable construction measures are required to address the needs emerging from policies in the Core Strategy and to address the representations made in this case.
- 8.21 I am also minded to restrict the use of the proposed premises in the interests of the residential amenities of neighbouring units and to address any concerns with activities from the site late in the evening and at weekends.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 It would be difficult to substantiate a reason for refusal of this planning application on access, layout or scale grounds. The proposals would add additional office floorspace within an employment area and the resulting building would not exceed two storeys in height. They are not considered to result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Planning conditions would be utilised to mitigate any adverse impact on neighbours, particularly through the removal of noise generating activities, control over future occupants and hours of operation. The proposals would be in broad accordance with Policies CS8, CS12 and CS13 of the Core Strategy.

10 RECOMMENDATION

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

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

- 1. Details of the appearance and landscaping (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.**

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. **The development hereby approved shall not exceed the overall ridge and eaves height parameters identified on drawing VER.H.M.P.ELEV.R1 dated 01/20 and revised 20.06.20**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and an appropriate relationship to neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

4. **The details of appearance to be submitted for the approval of the local planning authority in accordance with Condition (1) above shall include:**

- **Full elevation details for the proposed building**
- **Details of the materials to be used on the external appearance of the building hereby approved,**
- **Details of the slab, ridge and eaves height of the proposed building in relation to existing ground levels.**
- **Details of any lighting to be provided to the exterior of the building together with isolux diagrams demonstrating the extent and intensity of illumination,**
- **Details of bin storage provision including recycling facilities;**
- **Details of secure cycle storage;**
- **Details of any security and crime prevention measures incorporated in the building fabric or upon the site;**
- **Any gates, rails or other means of enclosure upon the site**

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance and functioning of the development in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12, CS26 and CS29 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan 1991-2011

5. **Details of landscaping to be submitted for the approval of the local planning authority in accordance with Condition 1 above shall include:**

means of enclosure;
soft landscape works which shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;
tree protection measures,
proposed finished levels or contours;
external lighting;
minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, storage units, signs etc.); and
proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines), indicating lines, manholes, supports etc;

The approved landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed programme of implementation. The trees, shrubs and grass shall subsequently be maintained for a period of five years from the date of planting and any which die or are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season and maintained until satisfactorily established.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area in accordance with Policies CS12 and 26 of the Core Strategy

6. **The development, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until the access and parking arrangements shown on drawing VER.H.M.ST.R1 (Site Layout) have been provided. These parking arrangements shall be thereafter retained in accordance with the approved drawings.**

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 51 and 54 in the Local Plan 1991-2011 and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

7. **Notwithstanding the details approved under Condition 6, the offices hereby approved shall not be occupied until electric vehicle charging points have been provided in accordance with plans to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.**

Reason: To ensure the provision of appropriate on-site parking in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Car Parking Standards SPD

8. **No development shall take place until details of proposed sustainability measures within the development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To ensure the sustainable development of the site in accordance with the aims of Policies CS28 and CS29 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), the Sustainable Development Advice Note (2016) and Paragraphs 150 and 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

9. **The building hereby approved, shall only be used for purposes falling within Classes E (c) and E (g) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (As Amended)**

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of parking in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

- 10 **The building hereby approved shall only be used between the hours of 08:00 to 19:00 on Mondays to Fridays.**

Reason In the interests of the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Markyate Parish Council	<p>The Council has objected to this proposal in the past and it would appear that none of those objections have been taken into consideration.</p> <p>There is very strong objection from local residents. This proposal is completely out of keeping. Access road is very dangerous, very narrow, therefore forcing Council lorries to reverse up the road. Cars cannot pass each other, often have to reverse out of the road.</p> <p>Access is of paramount concern. Very dangerous vehicular activity.</p> <p>Privacy is massively compromised, surrounding properties will be overlooked. The Council strongly opposes this application and fully supports the residents who oppose the scheme.</p>
Hertfordshire County Council – Highways	<p>ORIGINAL RESPONSE</p> <p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p><u>Description of the Proposal</u></p> <p>This outline proposal is for the Extension to block A/B to form additional offices on first and second floor above existing ground floor offices.</p> <p>London Road is an unnumbered "C" classified road, so vehicles are required to enter and leave the highway in forward gear.</p> <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <p>The Roads is Hertfordshire: Design Guide 3rd Edition (RiH) only requires a Design and Access Statement for this level of development, this has been provided by the applicant.</p> <p><i>Impact on Highway Network</i></p> <p>The application proposals include the addition of 853m² of office space. These are not likely to generate a significant number of trips. Therefore, HCC considers the proposals are acceptable.</p> <p><i>Road Safety</i></p> <p>No accident data has been provided to support the application.</p> <p>However, from a review of the accident data available on crashmap</p>

there is no accident history involving personal injury within the vicinity of the site.

Highway Layout

Access Arrangements

There is an existing vehicular access on London Road, which appears to operate without problem. This will continue to be used for the development.

Parking

The proposals will provide an additional 19 parking spaces of standard dimensions, giving a total of 66 parking spaces for 2064m² of office space, which is acceptable to HCC.

However, it will be for the Dacorum Borough Council to determine the appropriateness of the level of parking provided.

Cycle Parking

There are 10 cycle spaces currently and these will be retained.

Accessibility

Public Transport

The nearest bus stops are located on London Road. There is easy access from Markyate to the M1 and surrounding road network.

Pedestrian and Cycle Access

There are no dedicated cycling facilities on the surrounding roads, but the road is suitable for cyclists. The accessibility of the site is considered to be adequate for level small level of trips generated by the office development.

Planning Obligations/ Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

It is not considered that any planning obligations are considered applicable to the proposed development.

AMENDED PLANS

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:

COMMENTS

Description of the Proposal

This amended outline proposal is for the Extension to block a/b to form additional offices above existing ground floor office.

It submits documentation regarding EA comments on the culvert on site.

Analysis

The Roads is Hertfordshire: Design Guide 3rd Edition (RiH) only requires a Design and Access Statement for this level of development, this has been provided by the applicant.

Impact on Highway Network

The application proposals include the addition of 845m² of office space. These are not likely to generate a significant number of trips.

Therefore, HCC considers the proposals are acceptable.

Road Safety

No accident data has been provided to support the application. However, from a review of the accident data available on crashmap there is no accident history involving personal injury within the vicinity of the site.

Highway Layout

Access Arrangements

There is an existing vehicular access on London Road, which appears to operate without problem. This will continue to be used for the development.

Parking

The proposals will provide an additional 19 parking spaces of standard dimensions, giving a total of 66 parking spaces for 2064m² of office space, which is acceptable to HCC.

However, it will be for the Dacorum Borough Council to determine the appropriateness of the level of parking provided.

Cycle Parking

There are 10 cycle spaces currently and these will be retained.

Accessibility

Public Transport

The nearest bus stops are located on London Road. There is easy access from Markyate to the M1 and surrounding road network.

Pedestrian and Cycle Access

There are no dedicated cycling facilities on the surrounding roads, but the road is suitable for cyclists.

The accessibility of the site is considered to be adequate for level small level of trips generated by the office development.

	<p>Planning Obligations/ Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)</p> <p>It is not considered that any planning obligations are considered applicable to the proposed development.</p>
Environmental Agency	<p>AMENDED PLANS</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting us on the above application following the submission of further information.</p> <p>We are now in a position to remove our previous objection.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE</p> <p>The Environment Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On or within 8m of a main river (16m if tidal) - On or within 8m of a flood defence structure or culvert (16m if tidal) - On or within 16m of a sea defence - Involving quarrying or excavation within 16m of any main river, flood defence or culvert - In a floodplain more than 8m from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure and you don't already have planning permission. <p>RESPONSE FROM JULY 2020</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting us on the above application. We are now in a position to remove our first objection (Absence of a Flood Risk Assessment) but not the second (Proximity fo Culvert)</p> <p>Objection: Proximity to Culvert</p> <p>The proposed development is unacceptable because it involves construction of an extension over the existing development which is adjacent to the culverted River Ver. As submitted, it is unlikely that we would grant a flood risk activity permit for this application.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <p>The submitted Engineering Report Ref BA 4148 does not fully demonstrate that the culvert can withstand the load from the proposed development. The proposed development is likely to adversely affect the construction and stability of the culvert which would compromise its function, The proposal will therefore increase the risk of flooding to the local community.</p> <p>The developer does not explore de-culverting the main river. It is outlined in the South West Hertfordshire SFRA 2018, section 10.3 Existing Watercourses and Assets: 'All new developments with culverts running through their site should de-culvert rivers for flood risk</p>

	<p>management and conservation benefits.</p> <p>Overcoming our objection</p> <p>The applicant can overcome our objection by submitting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detailed design drawings of the concrete slab intended to reduce point loading on the culvert, as referenced in Section 4 of the Engineering Report ref BA 4148 - Calculations and ground strength details from site investigations along the line of the culvert to confirm the conclusions in the submitted Engineering Report - Culvert survey to identify the pre-construction internal condition of the culvert to demonstrate that the culvert can withstand any additional loading from the proposed development, - Opportunities to de-culvert the River Ver must be explored under the Environment Agency and DBC policy. If it is not possible to deculvert the River Ver it will need to be demonstrated that leaving the River in culvert is the only option.
--	--

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Address	Comments
17 Long Meadow	<p>This is gross over development of land surrounded by residential property. As a local resident the area is already suffering from flooding issues caused by development along the River Ver which has seen local residents home insurance rise dramatically in the last few years.</p> <p>You have indicated property prices are not a factor but for local residents it will affect the sale-ability of their homes.</p> <p>The property is two stories higher than any other property within the area. Noise from the site is already an issue in an area with numerous reports already made locally in an area which already suffers from noise from the London Luton Airport. That is not even taking into consideration for the actual building work.</p> <p>Traffic is a big issue already in the village with parking along the London Road causing congestion with London Road into the High Street single file for most of its length. The entrances and exits out of the village onto the A5 are already dangerous and busy at key travelling times with commuter traffic but also vehicles cutting through London Road to the local private school. It is not unusual to have to queue all the way down the road to exit the village and the nearest entrance/exit to the development offers poor visibility and is already an accident hot spot!</p> <p>This will only become more of an issue with such a large development where the likely hood is those working there will commute into the village and then park....already the buildings there have employees parking on the London Road competing residents! That would be after the development and access for construction traffic would pose an even higher risk. This also does not consider delivery traffic for offices!</p>

	<p>It would also provide very difficult access to emergency vehicles which should be a key consideration. The A5 was originally diverted from the London road due to traffic and residents safety and the increase in the traffic puts residents at risk.</p> <p>Pollution increase....more traffic coming into the village on a daily basis.</p> <p>Privacy of local properties....the development is located at the rear of and surrounded by residential properties and a building of this height will dominate two storey dwellings and overshadow gardens.</p> <p>Security. A large site will attract more visitors during and outside office hours and with security already an issue for local residents with and burglaries where people have accessed/exited neighbouring properties and areas through the existing development.</p> <p>We already have a substantial development built in the last 10 years with shop and office facilities with a large proportion of it sitting empty since its creation. An office of this size in this location would not attract enough interest for the rent costs/build costs and would likely sit 50% empty until the owner says its becoming a local eyesore and will apply for change of use from commercial to residential just exasperating the above issues!</p> <p>This has been the norm in surrounding towns such as Harpenden and clearly is on the agenda here...The building is already designed to look like a lot of apartment developments</p>
57 London Road	<p>Nothing has changed from the previous application in the context of our objections to the proposals</p> <p>Our primary objections to this proposed development are on the grounds of increased traffic activity both on the site itself but most particularly as influence on the traffic in London Road together with doubts that the parking and accessibility provisions will be sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of vehicles requiring access to the site has increased dramatically over the last few years and this often results in difficulties and queues at peak times in the mornings and evenings. - A surprisingly large number of vehicles also visit the site during the late evenings, early mornings (4-7am) and at weekends. This is in direct conflict with arguments made in the Design and Access Statement. - A large number of delivery vehicles access the site during any working day and more often than not are unable to turn round on the site - thus being required to reverse up the access road and out onto London Road. Particularly large vehicles regularly park up, partly on the pavement, along London Road, and the people making deliveries walk down the access road wheeling trolleys - Our own vehicular access from our garage, via our gate at the bottom of our garden, is rendered potentially dangerous by vehicles travelling at speed either up or down the access road. - We also have to be very circumspect about driving out onto London

	<p>Road. The fact that the access road is effectively a 'concealed entrance' means that vehicles travelling up and down are not expecting cars and lorries to be either turning into it or out of it. This is exacerbated by the number of parked cars along London Road making visibility even more limited. A number of accidents have occurred over the years including the recent writing off of a car parked on the SW side of London Road.</p> <p>Additional Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Design and Access Statement makes no reference to the location of the development right in the centre of the River Ver flood plain - the new parking spaces are located precisely on the line of the river - now culverted as it was an open V shaped channel behind Buildings A/B until 3 or 4 years ago. - The Design and Access Statement is disingenuous in suggesting that many employees are local people thus concluding that 'many walk to work or use bicycles etc.' We are specifically aware of only one person who lives in the village and walks to work; we have yet to see anybody with a bicycle; there are one or two people who either use buses or are dropped off or picked up by cars or taxis. - Although we have a partial barrier created by our garage we will be overlooked by the majority of the planned development and this raises questions of privacy - we also are affected during the night by the security lighting - triggered almost continuously by traffic from the site
82 High Street	<p>The traffic in the village is already at an unacceptable level with multiple jams and near misses at peak times</p>
67 London Road	<p>We object to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <p>Loss of privacy - The proposed revised planning application will now include a fourth floor covering nearly 50% of the total development which is a massive over-development as it will quadruple the height of this part of the existing building. The original plans submitted last year, incorporating 3 storeys, drew many objections from residents who are extremely concerned that occupants of the offices will be able to see into our gardens, where children play, and also into the living and sleeping areas of our homes. This is completely unacceptable to us.</p> <p>This new application has all the negatives of the original, but introduces an even greater privacy issue due to the increased elevation.</p> <p>Trees - Section 15 of the Original Planning Application states that there are no trees on the proposed development site. There are currently at least 7 mature trees at the boundary with the rear gardens of the London Road properties. Is there an intention to remove these trees, thereby causing further loss of privacy?</p> <p>Security lighting - The existing security lighting is very intrusive and is currently on day and night, shining directly into our bedroom and bathroom windows even though there have been numerous requests to rectify this. If additional lighting is placed higher up on the proposed development this would exacerbate the nuisance greatly.</p>

Parking - The parking in London Road is already a problem for residents and is also used by people working and visiting Ver House. The parking issues will be further exacerbated by the increase in occupation of the office space caused by the proposed development.

Over-development - As was stated in previous submissions, the proposal will increase the size of the existing property immensely, creating a large, overbearing building that will be totally out of character with the local area.

Site access - Access to/from the site is restricted due to London Road narrowing at this point for residential parking bays. There is a lack of clear line of sight when exiting, which has already caused several accidents. The access to the site is hardly more than a single track road between two houses and the extra traffic that will be generated by this proposal will increase noise and pollution and have a negative effect on London Road.

Noise - There will undoubtedly be an increase in noise pollution due to the huge increase in tenants and associated ancillary services traffic such as couriers, delivery vehicles, etc.

Infrastructure - The roads in the area are already very busy during commuter and school times, and the additional commuter traffic created by this development will only impact this situation.

Please note there is a school bus stop close to the site access road, which causes additional traffic at morning commuter times.

REVISED PLANS

We object to the revised proposal for the following reasons:

Site access - Access to/from the site is restricted due to London Road narrowing at this point for residential parking bays. There is a lack of clear line of sight when exiting, which has already caused several accidents. The access to the site is hardly more than a single track road between two houses and the extra traffic that will be generated by this proposal will increase the risk of accidents and also noise and pollution and have a negative effect on London Road.

Vehicles should only enter/exit the site in a forward gear. This is not possible here, as if a vehicle enters as another is leaving, the vehicle entering would have to reverse onto London Road to make way. This is a highly dangerous manoeuvre given the lack of sight line.

Parking - The parking in London Road is already a problem for residents and is also used by people working in and visiting Ver House. The parking issues will be further exacerbated by the increase in occupation of the office space caused by the proposed development.

Infrastructure - The roads in the area are already very busy during commuter and school times, and the additional commuter traffic created by this development will only impact this situation.

Please note there is a school bus stop close to the site access road, which causes additional traffic at morning commuter times.

The traffic in the village is already at an unacceptable level with multiple jams and near misses at peak times. This only adds to the issue and the construction work will bring large lorries to tight roads and cause danger to those in the area. It would be totally unacceptable to grant this application.

The village is already struggling to cope with current levels of traffic and noise.

Over-development & Loss of privacy - Although the revised planning application has reduced the height from 4 to 3 storeys this is still a massive over-development of this part of the existing building. The original plans submitted last year, incorporating 3 storeys, drew many objections from residents who are extremely concerned that occupants of the offices will be able to see into our gardens, where children play, and also into the living and sleeping areas of our homes. This is completely unacceptable to us.

There are other office spaces in Markyate, Hicks Road being one, which are still unoccupied after several years, so an application to increase office space at Ver House, where there doesn't seem to be a need, rather begs the question - is this an excuse to get the permission granted and then apply for a change of use from commercial to residential.? Given the foregoing objections, this should not be an option that the Council should consider.

REVISED PLANS

We strongly object to the proposal and are extremely unhappy with the timing of the consultation period. We received the letter updating us of the amendments/update on the application on 30th December, with a deadline of 6th January to respond by. The letter is dated 23rd December however due to the Christmas period the consultation time has been cut short, with others like ourselves no doubt receiving the letter one week into it having been written due to the Christmas bank holidays.

We strongly object to the application, again, for the following reasons:

- Flood risk - we are in a high flood risk area and understand that the gardens on London Road already experience flooding. We believe that this will worsen with increased pressure on the culvert and the surrounding land. We do not believe that this risk has been properly considered in the plans for this development, with it taking objections from the Environment Agency for the developer to admit that the development site is in a high flood risk area and thus provide a flood risk assessment and other documents.

- Loss of privacy - the proposed development will result in our whole garden, and the back of our property, being overlooked, with this including a bedroom and bathroom in our property. The proposed height of the building will mean that many individuals will be able to

see into our home and we therefore strongly object to the proposal.

- Noise and light pollution - we already struggle to mask the security lights that shine into our bedroom from Ver House, with these being on throughout the night, and this is something which will only get worse with an increase in the height of the building. Furthermore, we experience noise from the site, with bin lorries and other vehicles regularly driving between our property boundary and Ver House. This noise is only going to increase with more visitors to the site.

- Parking / road issues - the parking on London Road is already an issue, with residents struggling to find spaces outside of their own homes. This is only going to get worse with increased traffic to the site. In addition, the turning for Ver House is extremely difficult to see and the chances of accidents occurring on London Road is high and congestion will only worsen, with the turning only a few metres down from the bus stop outside of our property.

- Overdevelopment - in the Urban Design Assessment document written in 2011 for Dacorum it states that buildings in the "Inner Zone" of Markyate "should be two storeys". The proposed development therefore goes against this assessment and is a massive overdevelopment of the site which harms the residential amenity of the village. The building will be the largest in the area by far. We do not understand the need for such a large building, especially if it is to be used as offices as stated. We understand there to be empty offices sitting in the middle of the village unoccupied and given the current climate we don't believe that there will be a need for more. We therefore question what the intention behind this application is and believe that this building, if built, will be converted to flats which we strongly object to.

- On page 4 of the "draft" Geotechnical Investigation report dated October 2020 it states that "the adjacent building to the southwest may also be extended from single storey to two storeys" and then goes on to say that "the report is based on the above development proposals and the existing ground levels. Should either of these alter significantly following issue of this report, then the contents will require re-evaluation". Although it states that the building is not part of the scope of the report, we are struggling to understand why this is incorrect, with the proposals in fact for a three storey building! It appears that this document has been produced without full appreciation of the actual plans.

- The original application states that there are no trees on the proposed development site. As highlighted by other residents this is incorrect, with trees lining the boundary between the proposed development site and gardens of residential properties on London Road. This issue has not been addressed and no clarity has been provided over what the developer's intention is regarding these trees which at the moment provide a little bit of privacy between our property and Ver House. If these trees are to be removed we will lose even more privacy and will be even more overlooked by the proposed development. The inaccurate information included in the application and report is of great concern to us.

	<p>For all of the reasons stated above, we strongly object to this application and hope that our objection and the many others received are carefully considered.</p>
<p>53 London Road</p>	<p>The access road is already inadequate. It is a single track road for traffic and pedestrians and consequentially the traffic queues to access the site leading to congestion in London Road. There is already not even enough parking for residents on the road and current tenants are competing for road parking since there are currently not enough spaces at the offices. The proposed 19 new parking spaces will be totally inadequate for the increased traffic. There are currently 19 parking spaces and the proposal is to increase this by 19 when the block will be tripled in size. Clearly this is not enough. The previous application stated that many people will walk to work or come by bus.</p> <p>Observation alone demonstrates that very few people do that. It is very difficult to exit the site because of the traffic parked in the residents' bays and for traffic travelling north along the London Road it is a blind entrance so vehicles not familiar with the area travel too fast. Over the years there have been many accidents and cars being written off. Many large delivery vehicles have no turning point after they have entered the site and they have to reverse in. This has a detrimental effect on London Road as the traffic is held up while they are doing this. Recently it has been observed the some delivery drivers go in forwards and reverse out onto the road.</p> <p>Many delivery vehicles including large lorries do not go down the access road but park in front of my house and that of my neighbour at number 51, blocking our drives and disappear to make their deliveries therefore the situation would be exacerbated.</p> <p>Environmental assessment</p> <p>This states that there is no river but the proposed new parking area appears to be where the culverted river is. There is a history of flooding in the village. It also states that there are no trees that would be affected but there are a few mature trees and it unclear whether they would remain.</p> <p>Noise and air pollution</p> <p>The traffic on the access road would be greatly increased due to more tenants, more delivery vehicles and more visitors. This would lead to more noise and air pollution. This is predominantly a residential area and the size of the development would have a detrimental impact on all the residents.</p> <p>We have lived alongside the offices for many years reasonably amicably but the size of this proposal will change the situation completely. Many of the residents are not at work all day or retired or spend significant amounts of time at home with children so they would be unable to enjoy their own homes and gardens.</p> <p>Overlooking/lack of privacy</p>

Despite the owner having been asked on several occasions to sort out the security lights he has not done so. They are on 24/7 and they security lights are intrusive.

Appearance/overdevelopment

Bearing in mind that this is primarily a residential area the proposal represents a massive overdevelopment which would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties. It will be completely overbearing to those being overlooked and the tenants will be able to look into everyone's garden and living areas leaving no privacy at all.

REVISED PLANS

The new plans do nothing to address the issues raised twice before.

There is still no design and access statement on the portal.

Access and exit

After having read the comments from Highways Agency I do not believe that they are aware that the entrance to the site is a single track, not a road, and is very poor condition. Highways state that London Road is classified as a "C" Road and as such traffic must enter and leave the site in a forward gear. This is not possible for long vehicles because there is no room for them to turn around to exit. Instead they reverse in, causing traffic on London Road to be congested especially in the morning and evening busy periods. This includes council bin lorries. In fact, many of the delivery drivers find the exit so difficult that they prefer to park in front of numbers 51 and 53 and block their drives while walking down the track with their parcels.

The entrance to the site is a blind entrance when travelling northwards after exiting the A5 so they go too fast and cars exiting the site cannot see because of the parked cars. Highways Agency believes that the traffic runs smoothly yet there have been many incidents of cars being badly damaged or written off over the years.

What is particularly worrying is that cars start to enter the site and when they meet a vehicle leaving there is no room to pass so they reverse out onto the London Road. There is already not even enough parking for residents on the road and current tenants are competing for road parking since there are not enough spaces at the offices and some of the tenants park in London Road because of the difficulty in exiting.

Overdevelopment/privacy

This is predominantly a residential area and as such this plan shows no respect for the quality of life of the householders in terms of privacy and enjoyment of their own properties. For those in numbers 57 upwards it would have a major detrimental effect on them in that many offices workers would be able to see directly into their homes and

	<p>gardens.</p> <p>Since there is no design and access statement, we have no idea what they plan to do about the several mature trees.</p> <p>Noise and air pollution</p> <p>The traffic on the access road would be greatly increased due to more tenants, more delivery vehicles and more visitors.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>On the first application in 2019 the applicant stated that the offices were full and that he had received enquiries from businesses wishing to rent office space. It is difficult to see that the same situation exists in today's environment and also there are empty commercial premises in Hicks Road. It is possible that there will be empty premises and the way the staircases are placed the applicant may request change of use to flats.</p>
1 Long Meadow	<p>We object for the following reasons:</p> <p>Increased traffic, noise and disturbance and vehicles;</p> <p>We are already aware that there are issues surrounding the parking of existing employees of Ver House and with this huge increase in office space and vehicles already parking on London Road, our concern is that employees and visitors of these offices will use residential areas outside our property for parking.</p> <p>There is currently only one road used as an entrance and exit for access to Ver House, with the huge increase in vehicles this will cause huge problems for vehicles coming in and out, particularly large delivery vehicles. We have already had an incident whereby our fence was damaged due to manoeuvring issues with vehicles trying to get access and exit Ver House at the same time.</p> <p>There will be increased noise pollution from additional vehicles and employees. We have already experienced antisocial behaviour and had litter thrown into our garden on several occasions, which is a real concern, especially we now have a young daughter that will be in the garden.</p> <p>There will be increased air pollution in the area due to the considerable amounts of additional vehicles.</p> <p>The infrastructure of Markyate is not equipped for the additional vehicles, we already experience moderate traffic in London Road, exiting to the A5 which will have a huge effect on residents exiting the village for work. We are also concerned at the effects this will have in our roads and the maintenance of them.</p> <p>Obstruction of sunlight and Overlooking</p> <p>One of our biggest concerns is the loss of light at the front of our property. Although the design has now changed, the proposed plan is</p>

	<p>still to be situated right next to our boundary will block out significant amounts of light from the front of our property, making it very dull, dark and cold inside.</p> <p>This is now our young daughter's bedroom that will be completely overlooked meaning for privacy and the safe guarding of our child, the blinds will constantly have to be down.</p> <p>This overlooking will also be an issue for our garden, along with the noise and air pollution mentioned above and the increased threat of litter throwing whilst our child and friend/families children (who often attend our property) are in the garden.</p>
59 London Road	<p>I object for the following reasons</p> <p>1) Inadequate provision for current volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Access to VER HOUSE is via a single track road. It is neither marked properly nor situated safely to allow traffic to enter and exit. As an example my car was written off in November 2018 when a car travelling along London Road had to swerve to avoid a car leaving the VER HOUSE turning. The force of collision twisted the chassis and caused irrevocable damage to the children's car seats. This occurred at 2130 on a Friday evening.</p> <p>The traffic during peak commuter hours is significantly worse and I have witnessed over 20 near misses since November 2018. In addition I have had cause to challenge the drivers using the access road whom I consider to have been driving recklessly.</p> <p>In the Summer of 2018 one such driver came out of the access road and nearly killed my husband who was changing a tyre on his car. When challenged, the driver was astonished that driving 30 miles per hour along a single track road with restricted view was considered dangerous. Increasing the number of cars using the turning will only increase the likelihood of a fatal incident.</p> <p>2) Access for service such as waste collection/delivery drivers etc –</p> <p>Currently large trucks reverse down the small, single track access road because there is no room for them to turn at the bottom. This again causes significant traffic disruption and increases the risk to children who walk to the local bus stops and school. It also creates significant noise disruption as the reversing sounds disturbs my children and some of our elderly neighbours.</p> <p>3) Uncontrolled parking - London Road is sensibly not a controlled parking zone, however many of the current workers of VER HOUSE take advantage of this and choose to park outside our properties, rather than the allocated spaces near their place of work. Discussions with some of the workers who park along LONDON ROAD imply that they do this due to the poor access and the fear they feel when using the access road. Increased provision for parking outside the commercial properties will obviously not solve this if the workers continue to feel unsafe using the small, single track, limited view</p>

access road.

4) Over-development - As was stated in previous submission, the proposal will increase the size of the existing property significantly, creating a much larger commercial building in an area where other commercial properties are under utilised. It is unclear which new businesses will be attracted to a building which has dangerous access and limited services.

5) Security lighting - The existing security lighting is incredibly intrusive and is starting to cause significant harm and distress. It is on day and night, shining directly into our bedroom even though my neighbours have made numerous requests to rectify this. I cannot see how additional buildings, which will require significantly better lighting will not compound the issue.

6) Increased threat of crime and knock on impact of privacy - To ensure the building is secure and can prevent/deter crime there will undoubtedly be more CCTV, lighting etc. This will have collateral intrusion. There is nothing in the planning to explain how this will be managed and how it will protect my privacy. In addition Crime Prevention Theory is specific about the increased threat to neighbouring properties following a crime. The new development adds additional risk to my property without making any provision for enforcement agencies. Would the developers consider funding a new dedicated police officer for Markyate?

7) Loss of Privacy - The revised planning application now includes a fourth floor covering a significant portion of the total development. This appears to quadruple the height of the existing building and actually makes the building more intrusive than it was. As a result the development will overlook my garden and have an almost unrestricted view of me and everything I do in it. Would the contractor consider removing all windows above the ground floor to eliminate overlooking? In addition to protecting privacy concerns it would also go some way to reassure the residents that this application is not a precursor to the building converted for residential use.

8) Trees - Section 15 of the Original Planning Application states that there are no trees on the proposed development site. There are several mature trees at the boundary with the rear gardens of the London Road properties. Is there an intention to remove these trees, thereby causing further loss of privacy?

9) Design not in-keeping with local period properties. - Whilst the proposal may look in keeping with numerous new developments in the village, their closest neighbours are period properties and not comparable in design.

REVISED PLANS

The updated plans appear to have reduced the height of the development from 4 to 3 stories, however that is the only change and does very little to address the concerns listed in my original objection dated the 15th March, furthermore the recent crisis faced across the

UK compounds the main issues of traffic and parking. There is still:

1) Inadequate provision for current volumes of traffic. Access to VER HOUSE is via a single track road. It is neither marked properly nor situated safely to allow traffic to enter and exit. Whilst I have already given details about my car being written off and my husband being nearly run over, there is recent data from ONS that suggests a post COVID world will see a rise in traffic. ONS statistics showing that road travel has increased post COVID bolsters the inference that traffic to VER HOUSE will INCREASE SIGNIFICANTLY as people are forced to drive to VER HOUSE as they are unable to use public transport for health reasons or lack of capacity. This will have a knock on impact on the traffic, parking and air quality.

2) Access for service such as waste collection/delivery drivers etc - Currently large trucks reverse down the small, single track access road because there is no room for them to turn at the bottom. This again causes significant traffic disruption and increases the risk to children who walk to the local bus stops and school. It also creates significant noise disruption as the reversing sounds disturbs my children and some of our elderly neighbours.

3) Uncontrolled parking - London Road is sensibly not a controlled parking zone, however many of the current workers of VER HOUSE take advantage of this and choose to park outside our properties, rather than the allocated spaces near their place of work. Discussions with some of the workers who park along LONDON ROAD imply that they do this due to the poor access and the fear they feel when using the access road. Increased provision for parking outside the commercial properties will obviously not solve this if the workers continue to feel unsafe using the small, single track, limited view access road. Again we cannot ignore the impact that COVID will have on the way people choose to travel.

4) Over-development - As was stated in previous submission, the proposal will increase the size of the existing property significantly, creating a much larger commercial building in an area where other commercial properties are under utilised. It is unclear which new businesses will be attracted to a building which has dangerous access and limited services.

5) Security lighting - The existing security lighting is incredibly intrusive and is starting to cause significant harm and distress. It is on day and night, shining directly into our bedroom even though my neighbours have made numerous requests to rectify this. I cannot see how additional buildings, which will require significantly better lighting will not compound the issue.

6) Increased threat of crime and knock on impact of privacy - To ensure the building is secure and can prevent/deter crime there will undoubtedly be more CCTV, lighting etc. This will have collateral intrusion. There is nothing in the planning to explain how this will be managed and how it will protect my privacy. In addition Crime Prevention Theory is specific about the increased threat to neighbouring properties following a crime. The new development adds

	<p>additional risk to my property without making any provision for enforcement agencies. Would the developers consider funding a new dedicated police officer for Markyate?</p> <p>7) Loss of Privacy - The revised planning application now includes a fourth floor covering a significant portion of the total development. This appears to quadruple the height of the existing building and actually makes the building more intrusive than it was. As a result the development will overlook my garden and have an almost unrestricted view of me and everything I do in it. Would the contractor consider removing all windows above the ground floor to eliminate overlooking? In addition to protecting privacy concerns it would also go some way to reassure the residents that this application is not a precursor to the building converted for residential use.</p> <p>8) Trees - Section 15 of the Original Planning Application states that there are no trees on the proposed development site. There are several mature trees at the boundary with the rear gardens of the London Road properties. Is there an intention to remove these trees, thereby causing further loss of privacy?</p> <p>9) Design not in-keeping with local period properties. - Whilst the proposal may look in keeping with the numerous new developments in the village, their closest neighbours are period properties and not comparable</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENT</p> <p>In respect to the letter from the Valerie Spiers (Transport Department) dated 13 July 2020. I challenge the analytical conclusion that there have been no accidents. This I assume is based on police data rather than community safety reports and insurance claims. If the latter you will clearly see that the conclusion from the analysis is incorrect as my car was written off when a driver from Ver House pulled out into London Road and caused an accident.</p> <p>All other objections remain.</p>
51 London Road	<p>Firstly, we would like to raise the issue that the supporting documents for this application were certainly not available at the 'Published Date' of '20 February 2020' as it says online. It was in fact, sometime after this date that they appear to have been uploaded. In light of this, we believe that as the consultation period was considerably shortened for the residents of Markyate to respond to it the deadline should be extended accordingly.</p> <p>This new application all feels a little bit déjà vu - it would appear that none of the concerns raised by the residents and the community of the village of Markyate in March 2019 have been addressed.</p> <p>We again object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed works are an over development of this site. We have particular concerns that the increased size of the height of these works and upstairs windows of this development will severely overlook</p>

the rear of our property and impact on our privacy.

The site has single track access -over the years that we have lived here this access road has proven to be a major problem and it is only a matter of time before there is a critical accident where this access road meets London Road. It is a concealed entrance and is the only means of access in and out of the site of Ver House. Refuse collectors, delivery vans and lorries, struggle as it is to visit the site, it is quite apparent that this increase of tenants on the site will only exacerbate this situation.

We also experience frequent parking outside our property by delivery drivers who will not attempt the access road to make their deliveries, and quite often block the driveways to Nos. 51 and 53 London Road.

We would like to reiterate that the proposed plans still do not address the problems of access and we have concerns about what effect this may have for London Road at anytime of the day but more especially at peak times. Whether this site is commercial or whether (as it would appear to be) it is converted into residential premises the problems of access and parking still stands.

REVISED PLANS

The amendments to this application have still not addressed many of the concerns raised by the local residents to this site and the community of the village of Markyate in March 2019 and March 2020.

We again object to this application for the following reasons:

The proposed works are an over development of this site. We have particular concerns that the increased size of the height of these works and upstairs windows of this development will severely overlook the rear of our property and impact on our privacy.

The site has a long, single track access with a concealed entrance/exit point from/onto London Road. At peak times London Road can be very busy and at quiet times it can be very fast. Our concerns are that even as the site currently stands, and with fewer commercial units, this access point is dangerous.

We note from the Highways Agency's documents that vehicles are required to "enter and leave the site in forward gear". With the narrowness and length of the access road this is not always possible. In practice, and on a frequent basis, vehicles reverse without adequate visibility back onto London Road. Even if the driver is able to vacate the site in forward gear, when turning left they are quite often forced onto the other side of the carriageway in order to gain better visibility.

We thankfully note from the Highways Agency that there are no recorded serious personal injuries at this junction, however, the residents in the vicinity of this access road have witnessed many accidents at this junction involving numerous vehicles, in the worst cases a number have even been written off. Our concern would be:

	<p>how long would it be before a serious personal injury does take place at this spot especially if an increase in capacity at this site is allowed together with its associated traffic.</p>
<p>71 London Road</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter consulting my property in respect of the planning application for proposals at Ver House, 55 London Road, Markyate.</p> <p>Block A/B of Ver House is located within close proximity of my residential property boundary and will cause a detrimental impact on my property. I therefore have significant concerns with the proposals - I Object to this planning proposal. I have outlined these in turn below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overlooking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The building line of Block A/B is approximately 9 metres from my boundary. Within my property I have a child's play area including swings and a climbing frame for my children and their friends. <p>My family use this garden on a daily basis, and the presence of a multi-storey building overlooking this area would significantly and negatively impact on the ability to use our garden as currently enjoyed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The mass and bulk associated with the development would appear visually intrusive and overbearing to nearby residential gardens, and the large number of windows on the southern elevation will create overlooking concerns negatively impacting on the quiet enjoyment of these amenity spaces. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan (2004), Policy CS12 (c, f and g) of the Core Strategy (2013), and Section 12 of the NPPF (Feb 2019). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of privacy and outlook: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development by reason of its excessive mass, bulk and proximity to adjacent properties, would have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring and nearby residential amenity. Given the topography of the area, the new floorspace and extensive built form would lead to a loss of privacy and outlook to surrounding properties, specifically numbers 57-71 London Road and number 1 Long Meadow,. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10 (Figure 13), CS11 and CS12 (c, f and g) of the Core Strategy (2013), and Section 12 of the NPPF (Feb 2019). - Design, scale, bulk, massing, appearance, overdevelopment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o By reason of the proposed excessive size, scale, bulk, appearance and visual dominance of the proposed extension and additional floorspace, the proposals would amount to an overdevelopment of the application site creating an overbearing form of development. In view of this, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10 (Figure 13), CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), and Section 12 of the NPPF (Feb 2019). - Siting, design, out of character with the area:

o The predominant character of Markyate, and the immediate area surrounding of the subject site is that of 2 storey traditionally-formed dwellinghouses. The proposal, by virtue of its long, continuous, unbroken façade, overly dominant height, scale and bulk, would be wholly out of character with the local area, and would be detrimental to the character of the area. In view of this, the proposal is considered to be contrary to saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10 (Figure 13), CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), and Section 12 of the NPPF (Feb 2019).

- Impact on highways, noise and disturbance, intense use of the site, impact on amenity:

o There is a local issue of existing businesses and their employees at Ver House already parking vehicles (cars, vans and HGVs) in the residential parking bays on London Road, creating severe highway safety and pedestrian safety concerns along London Road. Planning policy at all levels seeks, inter alia, to ensure that new development does not cause highways or parking issues to the detriment of highway safety. There are already issues arising from both the tenants of the existing buildings, along with their related traffic e.g. courier/delivery vehicles

o By significantly increasing the built floorspace at this site and the number of visitors/deliveries, neighbouring residents will experience further highway safety issues exacerbating and magnifying the existing concerns, resulting in an unsafe and uncontrolled arrangement, negatively impacting on the local highway network and creating further car parking pressure along London Road. Furthermore, this will create an unacceptable living environment for existing residents in terms of additional noise and disturbance from vehicular comings and goings. The proposal would therefore conflict with Saved Appendix 4 and Saved Policies 51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60 and 62 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Section 9 of the NPPF (Feb 2019).

I have spoken with my neighbours that are also directly affected by the proposals, and as you can see from various submissions on the online portal, they share the same concerns as I have raised above. I therefore request that you visit my property in order to fully understand my concerns and those of my neighbours, and to better understand the impact this proposal would have on the surrounding residential environment.

Further, I formally request the opportunity to speak at any planning committee that this application may be heard at. Given the significant scale of these proposals for Markyate, I have copied this email to our local Ward Councillors and will be speaking with them separately regarding this matter.

I would additionally ask you to confirm the existing permissions on this property - from the submission, I understand that this is an office premises. I am confused therefore as to how this includes the maintenance and repair of vehicles used for racing, which includes frequent noise on Saturday mornings.

	<p>Should you decide to grant this permission, I would request that you withhold any Permitted Development allowing the later conversion of these plans to become residential.</p> <p>I look forward to your confirmation of receipt of the above formal representations, and reserve the right to review these comments in the future.</p>
65 London Road	<p>The intended height of the plans would limit light, overlook our property completely – and give us complete loss of privacy. They would be overlooking gardens where children play and into backs of the house and back bedrooms.</p> <p>The parking on London Road is incredibly limited and overloaded - with people having to park on grass verges. The current parking in Ver House is very full - there is no way the extra cars that this development would bring would be able to park - and park safely.</p> <p>The extra traffic this would create would be very dangerous, and disruptive to the already incredibly busy main road - especially at rush hour. Thus creating more pollution, noise and possibility of accidents.</p> <p>The turning to Ver House is hidden and has narrowing to slow traffic on the road right at the entrance - with cars parked both sides this is already a dangerous turning to get in and out of. The access road is not wide enough for 2 way traffic.</p> <p>There was a previously unauthorised culvert that was put in by the owners around the back of Ver House and this may make flooding more likely. The end of the gardens do flood.</p> <p>The back of Ver House is currently used for vehicle maintenance and illegal burning of waste - which I believe isn't known to the council and may require some contaminated land investigation.</p> <p>A drag racing car can be heard and seen revving up and down the road too.</p> <p>The actual work will be incredibly intrusive with vehicles and noise and increased traffic and pollution. The road and access road are not suitable for heavy traffic, loads and equipment. The impact on residents would be horrendous.</p> <p>The size of the development is completely out of keeping with the area. There are no facilities down this end of the village.</p> <p>It is stated there are no trees - there are mature trees at the bottom of the gardens. The height of the intended extension is from 1 and 2 floors to 4 floors - this would mean a long build. The foundations on an area prone to flooding would need to be very deep. The plans also look as though they may try to get change of usage to flats in the future?</p> <p>The view from the upstairs of houses would no longer be fields - they</p>

	<p>would be people in offices.</p>
<p>69 London Road</p>	<p>We strongly object this development for the following reasons:</p> <p>Over development - We consider the proposed plans to be an overdevelopment of this site. The proposal to extend the existing building into a large 4 story block is excessive and totally out of place / character within the area.</p> <p>Overlooking / loss of privacy - Block A/B of Ver House is located within close proximity to my property boundary. This proposed development will see the existing building significantly increase in size, becoming 4 stories high. The occupants of the offices would have clear view into my garden and all of our living space at the back of our house which is highly intrusive and causes me huge concern.</p> <p>We enjoy the use our garden regularly and the proposed development would significantly impact on this. A development of this size overlooking our properties in this way is completely unacceptable, especially considering that children play in these gardens.</p> <p>Loss of light - we have concerns about the loss of light to our garden and property. The proposed construction of this 4 story building so close to the boundary of our property is likely to block out a huge amount of light.</p> <p>Trees - I understand that the planning application refers to there being no trees on the proposed development site? This is incorrect as there are a number of very mature trees at the boundary with the gardens of the London Road properties.</p> <p>Adequacy of parking - There is already a big problem with parking on London Road which is made worse by the current employees, customers and visitors to the Ver House businesses using the residential parking bays. This will only become worse with the proposed development and potential cause a danger.</p> <p>Site access - The access road to Ver House s a single track road between two houses at a point at which the road narrows. In my opinion this is not suitable for the increased volume of traffic that the proposed development would generate and would be potentially dangerous. There is already a big problem with traffic and congestion on London Road at peak times.</p> <p>Environmental impact - The additional traffic that is likely to occur will cause an increase in pollution which will negatively impact on the London Road area.</p> <p>Noise - There will undoubtedly be an increase in noise caused by the number of additional employees and visitors to the site and the number of delivery vehicles to the businesses. This will significantly impact on all local residence</p>
<p>63 London Road</p>	<p>The new property will overlook my back garden and there will be a major loss of privacy, not only in the garden but office workers will now be able to see into my bedroom.</p>

	<p>The security lights at the moment are very intrusive and I believe this will get worse. As the lights seem to be on all night, if they are placed any higher, they will be shining directly into my bedroom.</p> <p>Parking is also a major problem; from the plans it appears they have an extra 19 spaces allocated to the new proposal, which seems inadequate as we already have office users parking outside our houses during the day and evening so when we return home there is no place for us to park nearby.</p> <p>Accessing the site from the single road on to London Road is a problem already, numerous times I have either been walking or cycling past the entrance and have had near misses with cars driving out as they were not paying attention. This will only get worse.</p>
15 Long Meadow	<p>Markyate is already becoming an over developed village which has plenty of new empty offices which can't be rented due to high rental prices.</p> <p>I feel the building will be too high, too large and not within keeping of the immediate area. It will overshadow neighbouring properties and our quiet residential road.</p> <p>Traffic will increase on an already busy part of London Road where visibility is poor when turning in and out.</p> <p>We are already affected by the noise pollution coming from the existing building and often until 9/10pm on a weekday.</p> <p>The River Ver is essential to avoid flooding in the immediate area and I feel that adding such a big development will endanger this safety net. The current user of the existing building already causes problems where the river enters that plot. I have had to clear debris to allow it to flow effectively during the most recent storms.</p>
5 Long Meadow	<p>We believe that the proposal represents gross overdevelopment of what is currently a small commercial site. The proposed plan is for a building which is two storey's higher than any neighbouring properties. This development would seriously restrict the light coming onto our property and the privacy of our home and gardens</p>
52 Long Meadow	<p>Ver House is accessed via a very small driveway type entrance onto the main road that runs through our village. My concerns are that they will look to get access via our beautiful cul de sac and completely ruin our road.</p> <p>The building is going to be too high, and I for one don't want to look out onto that! Besides which this is going to really impact on the surrounding homes overlooking them, denying their light and privacy.</p> <p>Our village had already had multiple developments and this has had a major impact on our already narrow streets. We are often grid locked if the A5 is busy when cars use our village as a cut through. Adding</p>

	<p>more cars at peak times for more offices will only make it so much worse. The infrastructure just isn't here to support more people/cars</p> <p>Which brings me to my next point - we have numerous office spaces/shop fronts on Hicks Road that have been empty for several years, if we can't fill those why does this developer think they can fill this one, it doesn't make sense. Unless of course, the plan would be to change useage and then go for flats which again would have a massive impact and one this village can't cope with.</p> <p>Long Meadow and Ver House is on a flood plain, over development is going to compound this problem - our household insurance doubled this year and has affected all residents. This could make matters far worse for us.</p> <p>We have a great environment in our village and over development whether that be housing or industrial or office is slowly encroaching and ruining it.</p> <p>I am sure if there were any call for this kind of service in our area, Hicks Road would be thriving instead of looking desolate as it does</p>
31 Long Meadow	<p>A ridiculously large development on a very small area. I strongly suspect the idea is to gain PP develop then convert to flats, but even if not, I strongly object for the reasons stated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affect local ecology - Close to adjoining properties - Development too high - General dislike of proposal - Inadequate access - Inadequate parking provision - Inadequate public transport provisions - Increase danger of flooding - Increase in traffic - Increase of pollution - Loss of light - Loss of parking - Loss of privacy - More open space needed on development - Noise nuisance
63 London Road	<p>We strongly object to this application on a number of reasons.</p> <p>The new property will overlook my back garden and there will be a major loss of privacy, not only in the garden but office workers will now be able to see into my bedroom.</p> <p>The security lights at the moment are very intrusive and I believe this will get worse. As the lights seem to be on all night, if they are placed any higher, they will be shining directly into my bedroom.</p> <p>Parking is also a major problem; from the plans it appears they have an extra 19 spaces allocated to the new proposal, which seems inadequate as we already have office users parking outside our</p>

	<p>houses during the day and evening so when we return home there is no place for us to park nearby.</p> <p>Accessing the site from the single road on to London Road is a problem already, numerous times I have either been walking or cycling past the entrance and have had near misses with cars driving out as they were not paying attention. This will only get worse</p> <p>REVISED PLANS</p> <p>I've just looked at the amended plans submitted on the 30th June 2020, and again I strongly object to this application.</p> <p>I don't feel the amended plans make any difference to my original objections from the 16th March. Having read the Flood Risk Assessment report with interest, it appears the site is located within Flood Zone 3 (high risk of flooding). I am now concerned any major changes without any adequate safeguards may result in an increased risk to flooding in the area and the adjoining properties.</p>
61 London Road	<p>I object to this planning application due to my significant concerns about the impact of this development on myself, my family and the community.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overdevelopment - Markyate is a largely residential village with some small areas of industrial/commercial development, these areas are currently underutilised with many standing empty including the new units in the Hicks Road development which have been empty since being completed some years ago. I do not believe that the village has the need for further commercial premises, if there was a need the existing premises would be used. Additionally most commercial building is zoned in the centre of the village, closer to shops, post office and cafe, the Ver House units are surrounded by housing with no facilities for workers. 2. Noise - the nearly doubled floor area in Ver House will lead to a corresponding increase in workers, visitors and deliveries which will greatly increase noise levels for all of the houses surrounding this development. Noise is already an ongoing issue from traffic and planes, the addition of this increased noise will make use of our gardens incredibly uncomfortable. 3. Traffic and access - The access road to Ver House is a single track fairly unmade up road which turns onto London Road at a narrowed section between houses. At peak times the current workers at Ver House cause significant blockage of the road and genuine fear of accident. I generally have to park on the opposite side of the road and at these times it is quite scary to try and get into or out of my car, with speeding cars heading for the A5 and into/out of the access road. As I said, the access road is single track and deliveries to Ver House are a particular issue as they often have to park in London Road and manually handle the delivery down the access road because it seems that it is not possible to turn around a medium sized/larger van/lorry. This causes blockages in the street, affects visibility for traffic travelling along London Road and people pulling out

of parking spaces or driveways. They often have to park either opposite our house and across the pavement or outside my neighbour's houses (again on the pavement) forcing pedestrians to walk out into the road). This problem is likely to be magnified during any building phase of this proposed development with the delivery of building materials and plant and then ongoing following completion. This increase in traffic and deliveries is not suitable for this residential area and not helped by the narrow access road.

4. Privacy - Although the latest plans appear to be lower than the previous version they are still out of proportion with surrounding residential development and with a large number of windows overlooking our and neighbouring gardens and houses. The plans virtually double the existing area and we must assume that will lead to a doubling of activity, noise and workers all overlooking our house and garden. These units directly overlook our house and garden which will be incredibly invasive with a serious impact on our privacy and quality of life. The size of the block is not in keeping with the village surroundings, it is relatively close to our boundaries and will overshadow/block our light and view. Security lights on the existing buildings already shine directly into our house all night and with additional floors this type of invasive development will have major detrimental effect on all of our lives.

REVISED PLANS

In addition to our previous comments and along with many of our neighbours we strongly object to this development for the following reasons.

Inadequate/Dangerous Access - The narrow single track access way is really a concealed entrance partly due to the road layout where the access road joins London Road - adjacent to traffic calming measures which partially restrict the view of cars both pulling out of the access road and travelling along London Road. And also because it is a very narrow roadway between houses and garden fences which also restrict the view. Deliveries to the units at Ver House regularly have to be unloaded on London Road causing traffic issues. Larger vans and lorries, including the DBC refuse lorries, have to reverse along the accessway because there is insufficient room to turn around on the Ver House forecourt. This again causes traffic disruption and danger to pedestrians and drivers.

Traffic & traffic increase- Markyate suffers with severe traffic problems (as evidenced by the introduction of a 20mph zone slightly further along the road. If these commercial units were all full the increase in traffic would be unconscionable as, based on the existing workers at Ver House who all travel by car, there would be a doubling of traffic to the building, along with increase in pollution. It is already dangerous to walk along the pavement across the accessway during rush hour as cars leaving and entering Ver House (often at speed) and the increase would seriously impact neighbours. This situation is evidenced by the accident on London Road when a car exiting the Ver House accessway and a car travelling along London Road collided and hit my neighbour's parked car, writing it off. I often park on London Road and

have been unable to safely get out of or into my car due to the volume of traffic during rush hour which will be made significantly worse by this development.

The development is too high and out of keeping with the character of the area - the current Ver House development is low level and although not ideal in a residential area it is relatively unobtrusive. The new development will be much higher and much more visible from the surrounding residences. This is a residential area of mainly 19th century houses so any modern construction is out of character, the size (both length and height) make this development wholly inappropriate and detrimental to the area. The current building overlooks my house and garden with direct sight from Ver House into our windows which is extremely disquieting. The huge increase in height and numbers of windows and people on site will greatly increase that very real sense of invasion of privacy from Ver House. This lack of privacy in and around our home is worsened by the security lights which are on all night and shine into our windows. With a larger building these lights could become even more invasive.

Noise Nuisance - The site is already noisy from cars, vans and business activity to the point where it is often uncomfortable to use our garden. With the large increase in activity this will become unbearable and have a very significant negative impact on our quality of life.

Conflict with local plan - I believe that increasing commercial activity in this area of the village is against the local plan and is completely unnecessary. There are empty commercial premises in the centre of the village where new units are standing empty and have been since they were built some years ago. There does not seem to be any need for further business premises in the village.

As I assume the owner wishes to profit from this development I cannot help but assume there is a secondary intention, for instance for future change of use to residential premises.

Affect on local ecology - I am not an expert but the intention to build car parking over the culverted river Ver seems to be less than ideal.

The report seems to say that it is questionable whether the ground can support the planned construction over the river. In my opinion any building over the river is likely to further pollute the river which is already subject to pollution from the roads and fields surrounding the village. We have newts, frogs and hedgehogs as well as other birds and animal life in our garden and I strongly object to any impact on them.

Additionally the papers state that there are no trees on the site, however there are a large number of mature trees along the boundary between our gardens and Ver House, these should be preserved and not ignored or worse, removed because they have been overlooked.

Increased danger of flooding - the village has been subject to flooding due to being in the bottom of a steep sided valley and every time further hard standing is laid this is likely to impact the water flow. The

	<p>larger parking area could well have unintended consequences for the surrounding area.</p>
--	--

	<p>Additionally there could be consequences from improvements to the whole surround of the new building and presumably the currently virtually unmade accessway will be fully paved.</p>
--	--