

ITEM NUMBER:

20/03734/FUL	Demolition of 36 residential garages and construction of 6 new dwelling houses	
Site Address:	Garages At Sempill Road (West) Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Ian Johnson	Mr Ian Morrison
Case Officer:	Martin Stickle	
Parish/Ward:	Hemel Hempstead (No Parish)	Bennetts End
Referral to Committee:	The site is owned by the Dacorum Borough Council.	

1. RECOMMENDATION

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

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The application site is located within the residential area of Hemel Hempstead. It is not an allocated housing site and is therefore considered a 'windfall site'. Dacorum Borough Council's Core Strategy (2013) directs residential development to the towns and established residential areas, indicating that Hemel Hempstead will be the focus for new homes, jobs and infrastructure (see Paragraph 1.10 and Policy CS4).

2.2 Six new dwellings are proposed on land currently occupied by two terraces of domestic garages. These garages originally served nearby residents but over time the garages have become either disused or underused. Records indicate that of the 36 garages, 21 are currently rented and 15 are void (58.33% occupancy rate).

2.3 This application offers Dacorum Borough Council, as a provider of housing, with the opportunity to meet its own objective of providing high quality affordable housing. The scheme would also help to improve the local environment and security through new landscaping and increased natural surveillance.

2.4 The Council's affordable housing studies have identified a strong need for new, family-sized homes for local people. As such, and given that the development would be located in a sustainable location (being close to local facilities and public transport), the proposal is considered to comply with Policies CS1, CS4, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the Core Strategy, saved Policy 10 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and the National Planning Policy Framework (henceforth referred to as the 'Framework').

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site relates to two blocks of single-storey, flat roofed garages and an area of hardstanding situated on the south-western side of Sempill Road, Hemel Hempstead. The site is set to the south-west of Sempill Road, behind a grassed amenity area that comprises one mature tree. The site is roughly 0.13ha in area and is accessed via an access road opposite 24-25 Ivory Court. Pedestrian access is also available from steps off another access road to the south-east. The site is set on land on the north-eastern side of the Gade Valley, meaning that the landscape rises as you move north.

3.2 The site is around one mile from Hemel Hempstead town centre and lies within the Crabtree Character Area (HCA17), which is characterised by a mixture of dwelling types mainly two-storeys in height. Sempill Road encompasses an original 1960s development of terraced properties at its core but later developments have constructed detached and semi-detached units on its outer edges.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of 36 garages and the construction of six residential units (2 x 2-bedroom and 4 x 3-bedroom) with associated parking areas and gardens. The development comprises a terrace of three units, a pair of semi-detached units and a single detached property. All of the buildings would be two-storey in height. This application forms part of a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) that encompasses seven garage sites across the Borough.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

None.

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL3

Heathrow Safeguarding Zone: LHR Wind Turbine

Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Yellow (45.7m)

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

Residential Character Area: HCA17

Parking Standards: New Zone 3

Town: Hemel Hempstead

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

National Policy Guidance (2019)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Dacorum's Core Strategy (2006-2031)

NP1- Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS2 - Selection of Development Sites

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS8 - Sustainable Transport

CS9 - Management of Roads

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS17- New Housing

CS18 - Mix of Housing

CS19 - Affordable Housing

CS26 - Green Infrastructure
CS29- Sustainable Design and Construction
CS31 - Water Management
CS32 - Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS35 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

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

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Area Based Policies: HCA17 (Crabtree) (May 2004)
Manual for Streets (2010)
Planning Obligations (April 2011)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)
Affordable Housing (January 2013)
Parking Standards (November 2020)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The key considerations relating to this application include:

- The principle of development;
- The impact on parking and the local road network;
- The quality of residential development and impact on visual amenity;
- The impact on living conditions of existing and future residents; and
- Any other material planning considerations.

The Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is considered a windfall site within the urban area of Hemel Hempstead, whereby saved Policy 10 encourages the effective and efficient use of urban land. The Core Strategy encourages residential development in the towns and established residential areas (see Policy CS4). HCA17 (Crabtree) highlights that infilling and the redevelopment of certain non-residential sites may be acceptable according to the development principles (see Para. 9.27).

9.3 The proposal would contribute to the Borough's affordable housing stock in accordance with Policy CS17, CS18 and CS19. As such, and given that the development would be located in a sustainable location, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies CS1, CS4 and the other aforementioned policies. Considering this, there is no compelling objection to the principle of development.

The Impact on Parking and the Local Road Network

Parking Provision

9.4 Policy CS12 seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. The Framework states that when setting local parking standards, authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport, local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles.

9.5 The recently introduced Parking Standards (2020) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides policy guidance for the amount of parking provision required for new developments. It highlights the following, per residential unit, in this area:

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

9.6 The standards indicate a requirement of three spaces for the 2-bedroom dwellings and nine spaces for the 3-bedroom dwellings (total of 12). The proposed layout provides 14 spaces (two allocated spaces per unit and two visitor spaces). As such, the parking standards are met and two additional visitor spaces are provided. The on-site parking provision is therefore policy compliant.

9.7 The SPD requires the provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging points within new residential developments. It recommends that 50% are 'active' i.e. can readily be used and 50% are passive i.e. can be connected in the future. The Proposed Site Plan (DBC-IW-SEW-00-DR-A-0100 Revision P1) illustrates 50% 'AEV' bays (active charging) and 50% 'PEV' bays (passive charging). Therefore, a policy compliant level of EV charging points would be provided. If the application is approved, the EV points would be conditioned to ensure that they are provided prior to occupation.

9.8 Whilst the proposal would meet and exceed the off-street parking requirements for a development of this size, a significant number of resident objections have been received in relation to on-street parking and the existing road network conditions. Concerns have also been raised in relation to the loss of the garage blocks and associated hardstanding area. These points will now be disused in turn. It is worth noting, at this point, that there is a simultaneous application for the redevelopment of another garage site on the eastern end of Sempill Road (see 20/03735/FUL). This other application proposes the removal of ten garages and the construction of four maisonettes.

On-Street Parking, Road Network and Loss of Garages

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

9.10 As mentioned above, there have been a large number of objections relating to parking, congestion and highway safety. Residents have highlighted that it is extremely difficult to park near their properties and the road is overcrowded. Sempill Road circles a core of circa 60 terraced properties, the majority of which do not benefit from off-street parking provision. As such, most of these residents rely on shared parking bays and the surrounding residential streets. Many of the residents have identified that the shared parking bays are awkward and larger vans, milk floats and commercial vehicles often take up more than one on-street space.

9.11 The concerns raised were passed to the Applicant (Dacorum's Housing Development Team) and a Parking Stress Survey was commissioned to fully analyse the situation and consider the

implications of the proposed development. The Survey, undertaken by Mayer Brown, was based on the survey criteria set out in the Parking Standards SPD. The findings of the Survey are discussed below.

9.12 The 'Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide' advises that it is recommended that Local Planning Authorities stipulate that in order to be an effective storage space for cars, garages must measure at least 6m long and 3m wide. The Parking Standards SPD highlights that if spaces are not at least this size, they will not be counted as part of the parking provision to meet the parking standards. The existing garages measure approximately 5.2m x 2.9m and have door widths of around 2.25m. As such, the existing garages are generally unsuitable for modern vehicles.

9.13 While unlikely that all of the garages would be used to store vehicles, the Survey assumes a worst-case scenario i.e. each garage lost would result in a displaced vehicle. Additionally, a car ownership exercise was undertaken to identify the likely level of car ownership for the proposed residential units. This was based on national census data (2011) specifically for the area within which the site lies. Trip End Model Presentation Programme (TEMPro) was used to increase the 2011 car ownership figures to likely 2021 levels to ensure that the assessment would be robust. The full car ownership calculations are provided in Appendix A of the Survey.

9.14 As discussed earlier, the scheme proposes 14 off-street parking spaces. The car ownership statistics revealed that rented houses in this area are, on average, likely to have 0.99 cars per property. On that basis, the six proposed houses may have a car ownership level of six vehicles. This illustrates that although two visitor spaces are provided, it is possible that a number of the allocated parking spaces could also be used for visitors.

9.15 Mayer Brown commissioned 360TSL Traffic Data Collection to carry out a Parking Survey for both of the Sempill Road applications (20/03734/FUL and 20/03735/FUL). The methodology used was in accordance with the Parking Standards SPD, Appendix C: On-Street Parking Survey Stress Specification. This requires all roads within 200 metres walking distance to be surveyed. As the sites are approximately 300m from each other, surveys up to 400m from a central point between them were undertaken to avoid any double counting of spare capacity. As per the SPD, the survey only counted parking bays of at least 5m x 2.5m to qualify as a parking space.

9.16 The Parking Survey was undertaken between the hours of 00:30-05:30 on two separate weekday nights, as this is considered the time that most residents are likely to be at home. The surveys were undertaken on Tuesday 16th March 2021 at 00:30 and Wednesday 17th March at 00:30. The Survey provides a map of the area surveyed and full survey results (see Appendix B: Survey Data in Mayer Brown report). The table below illustrates the average parking stress on the roads within 400m walking distance of the central point between the sites, across the two surveys.

Street Name	Total Spaces	Occupied Spaces	Empty Spaces	Stress
Sempill Road	131	119	12	91%
Ivory Court	17	12	6	68%
St Albans Hill	35	22	13	63%
Leys Road	29	18	12	60%
Risedale Road	13	11	3	81%
Newell Road	19	15	4	79%
Katherine Close	4	3	1	75%
Royal Court	12	10	3	79%

Total	260	208	52	80%
--------------	------------	------------	-----------	------------

Figure 1. Parking Survey Results

9.17 Figure 1 shows that at present, within a 400m walking distance of the central point, the average parking stress is 80% with a total of 52 vacant parking spaces overnight. The parking stress for Sempill Road alone was 91%. This figure is high and explains why numerous objections have been received relating to a lack of sufficient parking.

9.18 The Parking Survey states, when considering a worse-case scenario, up to 30 additional vehicles could be displaced from the garages. This takes the unlikely assumption that everyone who rents a garage uses it to store a vehicle. If this were the case, the overall parking stress would increase to 92% for Sempill Road and the surrounding roads listed above. It is noted that there are 16 garages currently vacant within close proximity to the site, including eight at Deaconsfield Road, three at Risedale Hill and five on Wheelers Lane. From checking Dacorum's mapping layers it appears that none of these sites have been subject to planning for redevelopment. One resident commented that one of the sites already had planning permission, however, this relates to a separate site off Langley Drive (see 4/00932/19/FUL).

9.19 If this application is approved, Dacorum Borough Council's Garage Management Team would provide the appropriate notice to each garage tenant. As per Agenda Item 14 (Page 3 of 6) of Cabinet dated 16th September 2014 (Update on Garage Disposal Strategy), all of those residents who currently rent a garage would be offered an alternative.

9.20 The Parking Survey assumes that the garages presently let accommodate vehicles. However, as previously mentioned, these spaces do not meet the Highways Design Guide or Parking Standards SPD's minimum size requirements. It appears that residents mainly park on the street, in shared parking bays or on private driveways. Some residents have highlighted that the garage forecourts are used for parking. However, these areas are not designated for parking, as parked vehicles may block access to the let garages. Therefore, the garage forecourts were not been included within the Parking Survey. From studying the existing and proposed site plans, it does not appear that any on-street parking spaces would be lost as a result of the proposal.

9.21 Dacorum's Verge Hardening Team were contacted to determine whether there would be scope to enhance existing parking areas or provide further parking areas in the area. Some photographs highlighting potential areas were sent from the Housing Development Team. They responded with the following: *"There is nothing suitable in this area, as all of the amenity greens in-between houses are too small. One has access problems also but is too small. Trees & Woodlands (T&W) said no to removing the good trees on the amenity green outside numbers 1 to 9. Most of the bays marked on the drawings are in visual splays of resident's drives, some have been put over entrances to private garages and most of the verges indicated on the drawing have trees on which T&W have said no to removing these."* Efforts have been made to improve the existing situation on Sempill Road. However, it appears that there is no scope for additional parking areas, mainly due to highway safety issues or trees.

Summary

9.22 The development would provide sufficient off-street parking for the proposed number of units, meeting the parking standards and providing two additional visitor spaces. The car ownership statistics identify that the future occupiers may only require six spaces. As such, the other allocated spaces could potentially be used for visitor spaces.

9.23 When considering the 30 let garages across both garage sites for vehicle displacement, the Survey indicates that the Sempill Road and the surrounding roads would be able to accommodate a

worst-case scenario for vehicle displacement. This is using the methodology set out in the Parking Standards SPD.

9.24 The Survey demonstrates an average parking stress of 80% on streets up to 400m walking distance away from a central point between the two sites. If 30 additional vehicles were displaced onto local streets, the stress could increase to 92%. Neighbouring garage sites could potentially accommodate 16 displaced vehicles. However, it is unlikely that a large number of the garages are being used for vehicles when considering their limited sizes. The Survey concludes a minimal impact on the local highway as a result of displacement of vehicles from existing garages and therefore a refusal based on parking grounds would be unsubstantiated.

9.25 Considering the large number of resident objections, there is clearly an existing issue with parking on Sempill Road. The core of terraced units with no off-street parking and the piecemeal development of other sites on the periphery, combined with the increase in car ownership over the years and the number of larger commercial vehicles on the road appears to have put pressure on the road network and intensified parking. Sempill Road alone was identified as being at 91% parking capacity in the two parking surveys.

9.26 The Framework, Para. 109 states that development would only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Although there is an existing issue, it is not felt that a significant number of vehicles would be displaced from the existing garages or forecourts. If some are, there is scope for re-location within the vicinity. The proposed development would over provide on parking for future residents and no on-street parking spaces would be lost. Therefore, it is not felt that the proposed development would significantly impact highway safety. Hertfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority have assessed the highway impacts and raised no objection to the proposals, stating, "*The proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highway.*" They consider the existing access and proposed layout appropriate in terms of highway safety and manoeuvrability for larger vehicles e.g. fire tender and refuse vehicles. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal is deemed compliant with the Framework, Policies CS8, CS9 and saved Policy 51 in relation to parking and highway safety.

The Quality of Residential Development and Impact on Visual Amenity

9.27 The Core Strategy seeks to secure quality design and deliver housing at a high standard. It also aims to provide optimum densities in the right locations. Policies CS11 and CS12 require development to preserve attractive streetscapes, integrate with existing streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of layout, security, site coverage, scale, height, bulk, materials and landscaping. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan discusses the layout and design of residential areas and provides on-site specifics, such as acceptable garden sizes, spacing of dwellings and crime prevention measures. HCA17 (Crabtree), sets out a number of development principles for new housing in this area, including:

"Design: No special requirements.

Type: Semi-detached dwellings are encouraged. However, terraced and detached dwellings may be acceptable where these types respectively form the majority of nearby and adjacent development. Plots may be acceptable dependent on their scale, resultant appearance and compatibility with the street scene.

Height: Should not normally exceed two storeys.

Size: Medium sized buildings are acceptable and encouraged.

Layout: Dwellings should normally front the road and follow established formal building lines. Spacing in the medium range (2 m to 5 m) is expected.

Density: Development in the medium density range (30 to 35 dwellings/ha (net)) is acceptable.”

9.28 The proposed development is for six new dwellings, provided as a semi-detached pairing (each with two bedrooms), a terrace of three 3-bedroom properties and a detached three bed unit. The properties would be constructed of red/brown brick, tiled roofs and grey windows. The drawings confirm that full material details are not yet decided and therefore, if this application is approved, details would be secured via condition.

9.29 Sempill Road exhibits a variety of different dwelling types and designs, and a range of sizes. Therefore, the design of the proposed units would not appear out-of-place or harmful to the existing streetscape. The overall scale and shape of the buildings would be similar to the surrounding residential properties and plot sizes. The garden areas would be commensurate with neighbouring developments e.g. Ivory Court. The designs include some additional design features such as chimneys, glazed tiles and brick detailing. These details would add some visual interest to the buildings.

9.30 Turning to layout, the proposed buildings would front the road and generally follow established building lines, noting the step-back of Plot 1, which follows the stagger of properties on Ivory Court. A separation distance of around 4.8m is provided between Plot 1 and 1 Ivory Court, aligning with the requirements of HCA17. The semi-detached and detached units would face the terrace comprising 1-9 Sempill Road and ‘step down’ the hill, similar to the existing terraces.

9.31 The site would provide a density of 46 dwellings/ha. This is higher than the recommended medium range of 30 to 35 (as per HCA17), however, saved Policy 10 seeks to optimise the use of urban land. Considering that the proposal is over-providing on parking and providing sufficient plot and garden sizes, it is not felt that an increased density would result in a substandard development or any other unacceptable impacts. It should be noted that higher densities are apparent elsewhere in the vicinity, for example, Ivory Court.

9.32 In light of the above, it proposals are considered to provide a high quality residential development that would satisfactorily integrate within the existing streetscape. The proposed buildings are considered as an improvement in design when compared to the existing flat roof garages. The proposals are considered to comply with regards to the quality of residential development and the impacts on visual amenity.

The Impact on Living Conditions of Existing and Future Residents

9.33 The impact on the established residential amenity of neighbouring properties is a significant factor in determining whether the development is acceptable. Policy CS12 states that concerning the effect of a development on the amenity of neighbours, development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of privacy. Paragraph 127 (f) of the Framework requires development to create safe, inclusive and accessible places that promote health and well-being and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Loss of Light / Visual Intrusion

9.34 The proposed properties would be situated some 27m from 1-9 Sempill Road to the north-east. To the north-west, Nos. 24 and 25 Ivory Court are sited around 21m from the façade of Plots 1-3. The properties on St Albans Hill, to the south-east, are over 30m from the flank of Plot 6. Considering the separation distances between the existing and proposed properties, it is unlikely that there would be any breach of a 25-degree lines taken from the mid-points of the neighbouring ground-floor windows. The proposal would comply with the Building Research Establishment’s

report, 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice' (BR209) in this regard. These separation distances also illustrate that the proposed dwellings would not be visually intrusive to the neighbouring properties.

9.35 The closest neighbours are 1-2 Ivory Court. The light assessment is different for adjacent buildings and a 45-degree rule of thumb is used. As the proposed terrace, specifically Plot 1, is sited forward of 1-2 Ivory Court, a 45 degree angle should be drawn from the outer corner of the building towards the front of the neighbouring property. Due to the set-back of Plot 1, there would be no breach of the 45-degree line. Therefore, no significant impacts with regards to light are identified. The proposal therefore complies with the BRE guidance and Policy CS12 with regards to light.

Overlooking / Loss of Privacy

9.36 Turning to the impacts on privacy, the separation distances highlighted above ensure that there are limited impacts on overlooking into neighbouring properties. The closest neighbours that directly face the site are 24-25 Ivory Court. These properties are situated on higher ground, approximately 21m from the front of Plots 1-3. Considering the distance and the topography, the proposed relationship is considered acceptable.

9.37 Plots 4-6 would be positioned at a right-angle to 1-2 Ivory Court. There would be an increase in overlooking to the gardens of these properties, particularly from the first-floor windows of Plots 4-6. Although the proposed properties would be slightly lower than the existing properties, an impact is identified. Mutual overlooking of gardens is common within urban areas. Views of the garden area of 1 Ivory Court is already possible from the first-floor windows of 2 Ivory Court and vice versa. Considering this, it is not felt that the proposed properties would result in a significant impact worthy of a refusal.

Demolition / Construction

9.38 In terms of demolition and construction, if this application were approved, these aspects would be controlled by Dacorum's Environmental Protection Team. Various informatives would be added in relation to this (e.g. construction hours, etc.).

9.39 The proposal would provide a high quality living environment for future occupiers and would not result in significant adverse impacts on residential amenity. The quality of residential development and the impact on the living conditions is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with the aforementioned policies.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees

9.40 There is one Horse Chestnut tree within close proximity to the site that must be considered. The submitted Arboricultural Report (ref: S236-J1-IA-1) identifies that no trees of significant landscape value or amenity would be detrimentally affected by the development. The Horse Chestnut would be retained but pruned to clear scaffold zone. Dacorum's Trees and Woodlands Department have reviewed this document and raised no objections to the proposed works.

9.41 The drawings found in the Appendices of the Arboricultural Report illustrate the root protection area and measures to protect the tree during the preparation, demolition, construction and landscaping phases (see S234-J1-P2 Rev 2 and S234-J1-P3 Rev 1). These details would be conditioned if the application were approved.

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

Landscaping

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

Ecology

9.44 An Ecological Survey and Bat Report has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority as part of the application submission. The report provides an adequate assessment of the impact of the proposals and is based on appropriate survey methods. The likelihood of an adverse ecological impact was found to be negligible. Hertfordshire County Council's Ecology Department have raised no objection but advised that a precautionary approach is taken. They also requested that informatives relating to birds and bats be added if consent is given.

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

Waste / Bin Storage

9.46 Developers are expected to provide adequate space and facilities for the separation, storage, collection and recycling of waste (see Dacorum's 'Refuse Storage Guidance Note'). The site plan indicates where bin storage for the properties is located (to the sides/rear of the properties). An area of defensible space is also provided to the front of the properties that could be used for bin storage. If the application is approved, the landscaping plan will capture details of bin stores to make sure the bins are satisfactorily disguised from the public realm. Taking the above into account, no concerns are raised about refuse storage and collection.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

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

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

Contamination

9.49 The Environmental and Community Protection Team have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed development. However, it is judged that the recommendation for an

intrusive land contamination investigation is made. As such, it has been recommended that two conditions be included in the event that permission is granted.

Drainage

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

Crime Prevention and Security

9.51 Hertfordshire County Council's Crime Prevention Design Advisor was consulted. Concerns were raised over the car parking area for plots 4-6 and it was advised that a lighting column be introduced to mitigate crime. This can be secured through the landscaping condition, which includes details of external lighting. A number of other recommendations were made to improve crime prevention and security on the site. These are listed in the consultation response in Appendix A. These were passed to the Applicant and the highlighted that *"Our landscaping design and Employers Requirements will address the comments from the Crime Prevention Officer. These will be included in the contract requirements."*

Sustainability

9.52 The development of Brownfield sites e.g. previously built upon, such as this, have a sustainable benefit as it results in a continuance of built development for each site thereby minimising the loss of Greenfield sites and consequential trees/habitat thereto.

9.53 The orientation of the dwellings has had consideration to the Dacorum Energy Efficiency and Conservation SPD. Windows are sized at 20% of habitable room footprints, to further reduce the demand for artificial lighting. The Applicant has confirmed that they *"will adopt a fabric first approach, with high levels of insulation, low levels of air leakage and systems to ensure controlled ventilation - all of which reduce the demand for mechanical heating and cooling."*

9.54 Furthermore, the Applicant has confirmed that the following measures will be implemented:

- All external planting will be native and will rely on natural precipitation only.
- Water saving devices will be specified e.g. low flush toilets.
- On site surface water disposal and attenuation measures have been considered and are included in the Drainage Strategy.
- The materials used in construction these will be of a low environmental impact over the full life cycle of the building.

9.55 The site would be subject to separate application for Building Regulations approval. These Regulations set out stringent statutory requirements for energy use and carbon emission targets, as defined by Part L1A: Conservation of Fuel and Power in New Dwellings.

9.56 In terms of construction, the Applicant has highlighted that the dwellings have been designed to be suited to elements of modern methods of construction and off-site manufacture, all of which contribute to reduced energy use in the construction phase. This can also reduce the site construction phase period.

9.57 It has been confirmed that during the construction phase of each site, the building contractor would be required to establish a Site Waste Management Plan in order to reduce, and enable the recycling of, waste building materials. Further, it has been confirmed that the building contractor would also register each site under the Considerate Constructors Scheme to ensure that appropriate targets are met with regard to site management i.e. in an environmentally, socially considerate and accountable manner.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The principle of redeveloping the garage blocks into affordable housing is deemed acceptable and in accordance with local and national policies. There has been significant objection from residents in relation to parking and the road network. It is understood that there is an existing parking issue on Sempill Road, but it not considered that the loss of the garages and the provision of six additional units would exacerbate the issue to an unacceptable level. In terms of design, layout, etc. the proposed properties would satisfactorily integrate with the surrounding area. No significant adverse impacts are identified concerning residential amenity. The impact on trees is acceptable.

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

11. RECOMMENDATION

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

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

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

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

2. **No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted the Flood Risk Assessment reference M03001-04_FR07 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting and Drainage Strategy reference M03001-04_DG03 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting. The scheme shall also include:**

1. **Limiting the surface water run-off rates to a maximum of 2l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event with discharge into the Thames surface Water sewer.**
2. **Provide attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.**
3. **Implement drainage strategy to include permeable paving, filter drain and attenuation tank.**
4. **Where infiltration is proposed infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365 at the proposed depth and location of the proposed SuDS feature.**
5. **Detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any**

connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling to ensure the scheme caters for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance for climate change event, with a supporting contributing area plan.

6. Demonstrate appropriate SuDS management and treatment for the entire site including the access road. To include exploration of source control measures and to include above ground features such as permeable paving.

7. Maintenance and management plan for the SuDS features.

The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

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

3. (a) The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the Preliminary Investigation Report submitted at the planning application stage (Document Reference: RSK Preliminary Risk Assessment 1921152-06(00) March 2020) indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination and so no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:
- (i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;
 - (ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.
- (b) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (a), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- (c) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:
- (i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (b) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.
 - (ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- o soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs;**
- o external lighting; and**
- o minor artefacts and structures (e.g. bike stores, street furniture, play equipment, signs, refuse or other storage units, etc.).**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10. **Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access onto Ivory Court shown on drawing number DBC-IW-SEW-00-DR-A-0100 (Revision P1) shall be widened in accordance with the Hertfordshire County Council residential/industrial access construction specification. Prior to use arrangements shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.**

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

11. **Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted a visibility splay measuring 2.4m x 34m metres shall be provided to each side of the access where it meets the highway and such splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction between 600mm and 2m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.**

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with saved Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS8 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and

Paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). The details are required prior to commencement to ensure that the construction of the development does not result in any risks to highway safety.

12. **Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted 0.65 metre x 0.65 metre pedestrian visibility splays shall be provided and permanently maintained each side of the access. They shall be measured from the point where the edges of the access way cross the highway boundary, 0.65 metres into the site and 0.65 metres along the highway boundary therefore forming a triangular visibility splay. Within which, there shall be no obstruction to visibility between 0.6 metres and 2.0 metres above the carriageway.**

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

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

DBC-IW-SEW-00-DR-A-0010 - Site Location Plan

DBC-IW-SEW-00-DR-A-0100 (Revision P1) - Proposed Site Plan

DBC-IW-SEW-00-DR-A-2206 (Revision P2) - Proposed 2B + 3B Dwelling Plans & Elevations

DBC-IW-SEW-00-DR-A-2207 (Revision P1) - Proposed 3B Dwelling Plans & Elevations

S234-J1-IA-1 - Arboricultural Report by John Cromar's Arboricultural Company Limited (dated 1st September 2020)

S234-J1-P2 Rev 1 - Tree Retention & Protection Measures - Preparation & Demolition Phases

S234-J1-P3 Rev 1 - Tree Retention & Protection Measures - Construction, Late Construction & Landscaping Phases

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

Informatives:

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

2. Thames Water

Waste Comments

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

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

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services>

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

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

7. If bats, or evidence for them, are discovered during the course of roof works, work must stop immediately and advice sought on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England to avoid an offence being committed.
8. Contamination

The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land.
9. It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence.
10. It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway.
11. The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence.
12. Where works are required within the public highway to facilitate the new or amended vehicular access, the Highway Authority require the construction of such works to be undertaken to their satisfaction and specification, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission, requirements and for the work to be carried out on the applicant's behalf. Further information is available via the website: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/dropped-kerbs/dropped-kerbs.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.
13. As per Agenda Item 14 (Page 3 of 6) of Cabinet dated 16th September 2014 (Update on Garage Disposal Strategy), all of those residents who currently rent a garage in a block earmarked for disposal will be offered an alternative garage. The Garage Management Team will wherever possible, offer a garage to rent in another garage site owned by Dacorum Borough Council in the vicinity of the development site.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments

Herfordshire Building Control	No comment.
Affinity Water - Three Valleys Water PLC	No comment.
Civil Aviation Authority	No comment.
Thames Water	<p>Waste Comments</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable surface water strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.</p> <p>There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes.</p> <p>With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services</p> <p>Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.</p>

	<p>Water Comments</p> <p>With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</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 subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>CONDITIONS</p> <p>1. Prior to the first occupation / use hereby permitted the vehicular access onto Ivory Court shown on drawing number DBC-IW-SEW-00-DR-A-0100 shall be widened in accordance with the Hertfordshire County Council residential /industrial access construction specification. Prior to use arrangements shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety, traffic movement and amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>2. Prior to the first occupation / use of the development hereby permitted a visibility splay measuring 2.4m x 34m metres shall be provided to each side of the access where it meets the highway and such splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction between 600mm and 2m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>3. Prior to the first occupation / use of the development hereby permitted the proposed access /on-site car and cycle parking / servicing / loading, unloading / turning /waiting area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of</p>

Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

4. Prior to the first occupation / use of the development hereby permitted 0.65 metre x 0.65 metre pedestrian visibility splays shall be provided and permanently maintained each side of the access. They shall be measured from the point where the edges of the access way cross the highway boundary, 0.65 metres into the site and 0.65 metres along the highway boundary therefore forming a triangular visibility splay. Within which, there shall be no obstruction to visibility between 0.6 metres and 2.0 metres above the carriageway.

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway pedestrian safety in accordance with Policies 5 and 7 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

INFORMATIVES

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

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

3) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other

debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

4) Construction standards for new/amended vehicle access: Where works are required within the public highway to facilitate the new or amended vehicular access, the Highway Authority require the construction of such works to be undertaken to their satisfaction and specification, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission, requirements and for the work to be carried out on the applicant's behalf. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/dropped-kerbs/dropped-kerbs.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

COMMENTS

This application is for Demolition of 36 residential garages and construction of 6 no dwelling houses. The site is located between Ivory Court and Sempill Road, both of which are unclassified local access roads with a speed limit of 30mph and highway maintainable at public expense.

ACCESS

Current accesses to the site are from Ivory Court and Sempill Road. The Ivory Court vehicle access will be extended to provide access to the 6 proposed parking spaces in front of plots 1, 2 and 3. Vehicle access to parking for plots 4, 5 and 6 will be from the existing Sempill Road access. A pedestrian way through the site will be maintained.

Parking

Each property will be provided with 2 parking spaces with an additional 4 dedicated to visitors. The informal parking for residents at the southern end of the site will be reduced. The applicant is reminded that DBC is the parking authority for the borough and therefore should ultimately be satisfied with the level of parking.

	<p>Cycle parking will be provided for each property.</p> <p>EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS</p> <p>The proposed dwellings are recommended to be within the recommended 45m distance from emergency vehicle access to adhere with guidance in 'MfS', 'Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide' and 'Building Regulations 2010: Fire Safety Approved Document B Vol 1 - Dwellinghouses'.</p> <p>REFUSE / WASTE COLLECTION</p> <p>Arrangements have been made for the storage and collection of waste.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highway, subject to the conditions and informative notes above.</p>
Trees & Woodlands	<p>The Tree Report advises in Sub-Section 9 (Schedule) that T1 should be 'Prune to just clear scaffold zone.'. I require the applicant to clarify this statement and advise the pruning specification (metres) expected to determine the overall impact on this tree.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant proposes to plant an additional 3 x trees along the publically maintained verge (A & B x 2 - Plan S234-J1-P3 v1). In order to determine their suitability for planting next to residential properties and being adopted by Dacorum Borough Council I require the applicant to confirm the proposed species, size and planting specification.</p>
Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC)	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above application for the demolition of 36 residential garages and construction of 6 no dwelling houses.</p> <p>As it is a minor application the Lead Local Flood Authority is not a statutory consultee. However, we can offer advice to the Local Planning Authority to place them in a position to make their own decision regarding surface water and drainage. We have reviewed the following documents submitted in support of the above application;</p> <p>- Flood Risk Assessment reference M03001-04_FR07 dated November 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting</p>

- Drainage Strategy reference M03001-04_DG03 dated November 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting

Following the review of the Environment Agency maps for surface water flood risk, the proposed development is at a predicted low risk of flooding from surface water and we do not have any records of flooding in this location. However, it is noted that the site is within the hotspot catchment area as identified within the Dacorum Borough Council Surface Water Management Plan.

The drainage strategy states that the ground conditions may be suitable for infiltration however no testing has been carried out. We note that there are no watercourses within the vicinity of the site however there is a Thames Water surface water sewer located in Semphill Road. A pre-development enquiry has been submitted to Thames Water and they have agreed a discharge rate of 2l/s into their network.

We note the existing car parking area that has been included within the site boundary is currently used by residents and no changes are proposed to it therefore the existing drainage will remain.

The drainage strategy for new development comprises of lined permeable paving for car parking areas and dwellings draining to three soakaways. As infiltration testing has not been carried out an estimate rate of 10-5m/s has been used for design.

We note that infiltration is being proposed for part of the site however no infiltration testing has been carried out. The LLFA would normally expect infiltration tests to be carried out at this stage to ensure the feasibility of the scheme. However, we note an alternative discharge mechanism has been secured therefore we can recommend to the LPA that the following condition.

Condition 1

No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the LPA for approval. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment reference M03001-04_FR07 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting and Drainage Strategy reference M03001-04_DG03 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting. The scheme shall also include:

1. Limiting the surface water run-off rates to a maximum of 2l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event with discharge into the Thames surface Water sewer.
2. Provide attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year +

	<p>climate change event.</p> <p>3. Implement drainage strategy to include permeable paving, filter drain and attenuation tank.</p> <p>4. Where infiltration is proposed infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365 at the proposed depth and location of the proposed SuDS feature</p> <p>5. Detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling to ensure the scheme caters for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance for climate change event, with a supporting contributing area plan.</p> <p>6. Demonstrate appropriate SuDS management and treatment for the entire site including the access road. To include exploration of source control measures and to include above ground features such as permeable paving.</p> <p>7. Maintenance and management plan for the SuDS features</p> <p>Reason</p> <p>To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of and disposal of surface water from the site</p> <p>Informative to the LPA</p> <p>Please note if the LPA decide to grant planning permission, we wished to be notified for our records should there be any subsequent surface water flooding that we may be required to investigate as a result of the new development.</p>
Trees & Woodlands	No objection.
Hertfordshire Ecology	<p>The site also appears to be known as 'The Western Garages at Sempill Road'</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Ecology on the above. I apologise for the delay with this reply. I am pleased to see an ecological report has been submitted in support of this application:</p> <p>o Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment (Bernwood Ecology, 1 September 2020);</p> <p>The site was visited on 13 August 2020 and comprises two rows of</p>

terraced garages on hardstanding with some amenity grassland. There is a mature Horse chestnut tree on site, which is being retained and should be protected from damage (including roots and overhanging branches) during construction.

The report provides an adequate assessment of the impact of the proposals and is based on appropriate survey methods and effort. The likelihood of an adverse ecological impact is negligible; however as bats and nesting birds are likely to be in the area, I advise the following precautionary approach Informatives are added to any consent given:

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

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

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

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

"Prior to commencement of the development, a Landscape Ecological Management Plan, shall be prepared, detailing how biodiversity will be incorporated within the development scheme. The plan shall include

	<p>details of native-species planting, and/or fruit/nut tree planting, as well as the location of any habitat boxes/ structures to be installed. The plan shall be submitted to the LPA for written approval and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA."</p> <p>Reason: to demonstrate the expectations of NPPF in achieving overall net gain for biodiversity have been met in accordance with national and local policies."</p> <p>I trust these comments are of assistance.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>Having reviewed the planning application I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed development, but that it will be necessary for the developer to demonstrate that the potential for land contamination to affect the proposed development has been considered and where it is present will be remediated.</p> <p>This is considered necessary because the application site is on land which has been previously developed and as such the possibility of ground contamination cannot be ruled out at this stage. This combined with the vulnerability of the proposed residential end use to the presence of any contamination means that the following planning conditions should be included if permission is granted.</p> <p>Contaminated Land Conditions:</p> <p>Condition 1:</p> <p>(a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.</p> <p>(b) If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:</p> <p>(i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;</p> <p>(ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.</p> <p>(c) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until</p>

	<p>a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (b), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>(d) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:</p> <p>(i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.</p> <p>(ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.</p> <p>Condition 2: Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 1 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.</p> <p>Informative: The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) & (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.</p> <p>The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land and I would be grateful if this fact could be passed on to the developers.</p>
<p>Crime Prevention Design Advisor</p>	<p>In relation to crime prevention and security I would ask that the development is built to the police preferred security standard Secured</p>

	<p>by Design.</p> <p>Physical Security (SBD)</p> <p>Front doors:</p> <p>Certificated to BS PAS 24:2016</p> <p>Windows:</p> <p>Ground floor windows and those easily accessible certificated to BS PAS 24:2016 or LPS 1175 SR2 including French doors.</p> <p>Dwelling security lighting:</p> <p>(Dusk to dawn lighting above or to the side front doors).</p> <p>Boundary:</p> <p>Exposed side and rear gardens with robust fencing or wall, minimum 1.8m height, gates to be secure with lock.</p> <p>Car Parking:</p> <p>Whilst its great to see adequate parking has been allocated, I do have a few concerns regarding plots 4 , 5, 6 and visitor parking as the surveillance is poor I would ask that this area is well lit (column light, bollard lighting does not meet the requirement of the Secured by Design standard).</p>
--	--

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
29	43	1	42	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
28 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF	Since the new houses were built in this road it has been impossible to park ,there is nowhere near enough parking spaces in this road , even if you allow more parking spaces for the new houses /flats please remember most houses now have upto 3 vehicles each house ,, I am generally in favour of building new properties ,but not overcrowding one

	area, there must be areas with more space
31 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I want to raise my concern for this planning application because the parking situation at shared parking bays is very awkward on Sempill Road for residents. Some non-residents park their cars/vans at shared parking bays because they can easily gain access from nearby area, the 6 new houses proposed in this application together with another 4 new houses proposed in another application (Ref. No: 20/03735/FUL) on other side of the road would only make this situation even worse. Furthermore, please take safety concerns into consideration because a serious accident happened last year, and multiple parked vehicles were damaged. Last but not least, when I come home from work, it's depressing that sometimes I have to drive up and down the road to find a parking space. In my opinion, this development would only cause inconvenience and frustration for current residents, therefore, I firmly object it, thanks a lot.</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I want to raise my concern for this planning application because the parking situation at shared parking bays is very awkward on Sempill Road for residents. The 6 new houses proposed in this application together with another 4 new houses proposed in another application (Ref. No: 20/03735/FUL) on other side of the road would only make this situation even worse. Furthermore, please take safety concerns into consideration because a serious accident happened last year, and multiple parked vehicles were damaged. Last but not least, when I come home from work, it's depressing that sometimes I have to drive up and down the road to find a parking space. In my opinion, this development would only cause inconvenience and frustration for current residents, therefore, I firmly object it, thanks a lot.</p>
39 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF	<p>I think this is a terrible idea it will increase traffic on a already busy residential road. Over crowd the roads with more vehicles where there is not enough space for as it is. Make it more dangerous for children to walk down the streets as will be dangerous crossing roads with vehicles parked everywhere. The added cars to be parked on the road from the garages that are currently storing them. Even if you allocate parking for this new development chances are each house will have more then 1 car and will take up more parking on the roads. Why not make more parking outside the houses where the green and the over grown trees are as these trees are more damaging to houses roofs and gutters</p>
19 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG	<p>Our house is on St Albans hill, exactly where the blind bend is, so there are double yellow lines at the front. We are lucky to have two parking bays to the rear of our house, however when visitors come, including friends and family, workmen, cleaners and gardeners (I require help due to serious health problems) we move our car to the parking area off Sempill Rd. Fortunately, this normally happens during the day when the demand for parking on is relatively low.</p> <p>However, my main objection to the proposed scheme is that as a local</p>

resident, I have observed there is a huge shortage of parking on Sempill Rd in the evenings and at weekends. in my opinion this is because -

- Many of the Sempill and St Albans Hill residences have always had zero parking and therefore have to park on the road.
- There has been an increase in house building (Ivory Court) and the flats on the other side of St Albans Hill in both of these developments demand for parking exceeds capacity.
- The increase in cars per household since the original properties were constructed

If you remove 36 garages and (in my estimation) parking for at least 6 extra vehicles in the adjacent 'carpark' there will be even more congestion in the area which is suffering from a serious lack of parking already.

I do fully appreciate the need for affordable housing in the borough, but in the 24 years that I have lived in this house, this side of Hemel has had more than its fair share of brownfield development leading to parking blackspots. I would site Red Lion Lane where the lack of adequate parking on the old Nash Mill site had led to a disastrous level of on-street parking. I suggest than the planners and architects should visit Sempill Rd in the evening to see the real situation.

Finally, I approve of a policy that provides two designated parking spaces for new houses that are designated affordable housing, but to allow this development when those 'rules' did not apply to the existing properties will seriously disadvantage all of the current residents.

I don't feel that any of the concerns I raised in January have been addressed by your Technical Note regarding parking.

My main objection to the proposed scheme has always been that, as a local resident, I have observed there is already a huge shortage of parking on Sempill Rd in the evenings and at weekends. in my opinion this is because -

- Many of the Sempill and St Albans Hill residences have always had zero designated parking and therefore have to park on the road.
- There has been an increase in house building (Ivory Court) and the flats on the other side of St Albans Hill. In both of these developments demand for parking exceeds capacity.
- The increase in cars per household since the original properties were constructed

If you remove 36 garages and (in my estimation) parking for up to 10 extra vehicles in the adjacent 'hardstanding area' adjacent to the proposed development 20/03734/FUL there will be even more congestion in the area which is suffering from a serious lack of parking already.

Your report does refer to the displacement of vehicles from 36 residential garages, however there is no mention that currently up to 10 vehicles park on the 'informal parking' adjacent to this plot of 36 garages. So, from looking at the plans at least 7 extra cars will be displaced.

In the building plan, it is suggested that the access road currently used

	<p>to access the 'informal parking', will have parking allowed on both sides - if this happens, these cars would obstruct access to all of the 8 new allocated parking bays. Restrictions would have to be placed at least on one side, but probably both because of the steepness of Sempill and the angle of the access road, so that reduces parking by at least 2 more additional cars.</p> <p>Unfortunately, it is impossible to say how many vehicles your survey thinks can park in the area beyond the current double yellow lines between the blind bend on St Albans Hill and the west entrance to Sempill. As a local resident of over 20 years, it is almost unknown for anyone to park in this spot as it is clearly unsafe. If, however the parking spaces on Sempill were fewer, people would be driven (in desperation) to park there with the inevitable extension of the double yellow lines to prevent accidents in this already almost 'blind spot'.</p> <p>I suggest you amend the available spaces in accordance with my comments above, I think that you have overestimated available parking by 12 spaces minimum and this is only what I can assess in the area closest to where I live from my many years of being a resident. I think that other people would be able to come up with failings in your plan for the areas close to where they live.</p> <p>I commend the current standards that calculate a provision of 12 allocated spaces for these 6 new dwellings, plus two additional visitor spaces, but fail to see why existing residents in the area are not given the same consideration and allowed to aspire to a higher car ownership. This is indeed double standards.</p> <p>I do fully appreciate the need for affordable housing in the borough, but in the 24 years that I have lived in this house, this side of Hemel has had more than its fair share of brownfield development leading to parking black spots. I would site Red Lion Lane where the lack of adequate parking on the old Nash Mill site had led to a disastrous level of on-street parking.</p> <p>I suggest than the planners and architects visit Sempill Rd in the evening to see the real situation.</p>
<p>11 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposed development of both parcels of land (currently garages) in Sempill Road to Residential properties</p> <p>Firstly I do not think that all local residents have been fully consulted-I live <100 yards from one of the set of garages and have never received any communications.</p> <p>One of my biggest concerns is further congestion of what is already a densely populated area where car parking is already at a premium. You can clearly see that people are having to park in St Albans Hill partially blocking pavements and creating traffic flow issues as simply there is not enough parking in Sempill Road.</p>

	<p>The traffic flow along St Albans Hill can often be an issue because of the need for residents of St Albans Hill & Sempill having no alternative but to park there which causes issues for pedestrians and especially families with prams. Just goes to illustrate how overcrowded the area already is.</p> <p>I live in St Albans Hill and I am also concerned that pedestrian access at the back of my house will also be potentially blocked due to the development of the "East" site.</p> <p>As mentioned on other objections Sempill is often subject to flooding and another development will also add to this existing issue.</p> <p>Finally, as a home owner there will of course be a detrimental impact to local property values if social housing is introduced to an already very densely populated area</p> <p>Please acknowledge my objections</p>
<p>30 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposed development of the garages in Sempill Road Having been a resident for 20 years I have seen continual development at the detriment to the original residents. The infrastructure of the road has never been altered to accommodate this increase in house building and now it is at a critical point. I work night shifts which should mean I miss the main parking issues but this is not the case. In fact for me it is even more difficult. I have constantly been blocked in by double parking and been unable to find the owners of the cars. Indeed at times I have had to call the police to get the vehicles moved, a complete waste of their time, just so I can go to work. Then when I return home because the road is completely full it is impossible to find space to park and I end up parking a street away from home.</p> <p>As you drive in or out of the road regardless of which entrance you use the parking along one side of the road means it is a blind spot as you leave or come in. Residents have to reverse back on to St Albans Hill which is a busy main road and there will be accidents.</p> <p>We have repeatedly asked for the grass verges in front of our homes be removed to make parking but the council continues to refuse to do this due to costs. However a drive or walk along the road shows numerous pot holes and cracks in the road from the previous house building where the road was dug up to accommodate new utilities, all never maintained.</p> <p>The idea of one space per home is completely unrealistic and outdated. At least three of the homes in my block are rented out by the room which means one house has three cars. A family can easily have at least two cars if not three so where do these extra cars go? Then add in the extra cars in the road which have been thrown out the garages and that means even more. Cars are already parking along St Alban's Hill now making it impossible for two cars to pass through at the same time. This is made even worse by the new flats which don't have enough parking and the residents are now parking on St Alban's Hill as well.</p>

	<p>The recent heavy rain has caused a huge flood at the bottom of Sempill Road which according to your consultant does not exist or happen. Clearly the council knows it does as a flood warning sign was put by it. It's about time that you actually visited the site at the sensible time and spoke to residents to see the challenges faced before submitting ill conceived plans.</p> <p>You cannot even imagine the disruption and upheaval this development would cause the residents and this will only cause even more bad feeling towards the development.</p> <p>There are new developments on Durrants Hill and Two Waters Road which are both social housing how many more can you add to an already over populated town? A search for a flat to buy brings up pages of social housing so there is clearly a good supply. The councils idea of putting houses on any scrap of land they can find is more about the money it generates than actually what damage it does to the current community.</p> <p>Enough is enough! Object Object Object!!!!</p>
<p>19 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development on Sempill Road, due to the over development already causing issues in Sempill Road with traffic, overcrowded parking and poor road maintenance.</p> <p>As a resident of over 20 years, I am extremely concerned about the decrease in road safety caused by the proposed new developments. The lack of adequate parking provision for the proposed new properties is also a great concern. Demolition of garage blocks at either end of the road will increase parking issues which are already at breaking point. Demolition and construction traffic will cause further damage to the road surface. Increased traffic will make access and egress to this narrow, congested once quiet residential road more dangerous.</p> <p>The last development which used the gardens from Deaconsfield Road has already placed extra strain on the limited space available in the road as the residents from the new builds don't use their driveways as intended, generally parking one car on their drive, and up to 3 other vehicles on the road. Vehicles from St Albans Hill residents park in Sempill Road due to having no off street parking outside their homes. The vast overcrowding of vehicles makes effective and safe pedestrian use of the pavements in Sempill Road almost impossible.</p> <p>Before granting any further planning applications for increasing residential properties and decreasing the availability of parking in Sempill Road, I strongly suggest the planning committee visit the road one evening or weekend to properly assess the situation.</p>
<p>91 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NQ</p>	<p>As with my comments on the proposed plan for 4 x 1 bed houses at the east side of Sempill Road, not enough car parking spaces have been allocated for these dwellings.</p>

	<p>In this area there are a considerable number of cars that park both in the garages and on land adjoining it, where will they be placed?</p> <p>There is also the issue of access to electric charging points for cars belonging to current residents of Sempill Road, where does the council envisage providing these?</p>
<p>9 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG</p>	<p>I am submitting this objection to the proposed development for reasons that fall into the areas of traffic/parking and drainage.</p> <p>Traffic/Parking Parking in this area is already well beyond saturation point: as things stand Sempill Road itself has more than the maximum number of vehicles competing for the limited residential parking; the additional properties already built on the upper side mean the road is even now 'supporting' far more than originally envisaged with nowhere near the generally accepted two spaces per dwelling. Hence even now, a mere handful (or less) of extra visiting cars 'abandoned' in the roadway is enough to challenge free flow and access along its entirety for anything, let alone for commercial and more specifically emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Add to the above the lack of any off-road parking for the residents of the Sempill Road side of St Albans Hill. The existing small parking area immediately below the proposed development currently at least provides some seven or eight additional spaces both for the minimal alleviation of both of these problems. The proposal would see even that area taken solely for use by the new residents and their visitors, (although having said that, that would be for a maximum of two vehicles per new dwelling and two visitors across all six). Any extra - including delivery, maintenance and other service vehicles - would then also be forced to 'park' in and inevitably block the existing roadway to all.</p> <p>On top of all of this, it is evident from objections already lodged that a number of existing residents rent garages amongst those that would be demolished by this proposal. These vehicles would then also need to be added into the total competing for this severely limited space.</p> <p>The junction at that end of Sempill Road onto St Albans Hill is challenging at the best of times. It is a steep slope running down onto (or up off) a busy thoroughfare carrying traffic travelling at - and frequently above - the speed limit all day and most of the night. The restricting and disruption of traffic resulting from the extra parked traffic on the Sempill Road slope will inevitably make this a more dangerous pinch-point.</p> <p>Drainage Referring once again to the junction of Sempill Road and St Albans Hill adjacent to the proposed development, this is currently subjected to repeated flooding following the slightest of downpours. Any additional collection, let alone that from the roofs of six new dwellings, flowing down the system to that low point will significantly worsen this problem.</p>
<p>58 Sempill Road</p>	<p>I object to both proposals of developing Sempill Road any further that it</p>

<p>Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>has already.</p> <p>There isn't enough roadside parking or parking spaces, to cope with the current volume of cars on Sempill Road and surrounding Streets/Roads. Adding more dwellings and only allowing 1 space per property is not realistic, as most households have 1 car per adult.</p> <p>These extra vehicles that have not been catered for, will end up parking in the bays along the top of Sempill Road and down the roadside to the East and West of Sempill, which will force existing Sempill residents to park elsewhere or the new residents to use the entrances to the new houses as parking areas, blocking existing drives, adding more congestion to the corners of the Road, and reducing the already poor visibility of oncoming traffic.</p> <p>I have recently witnessed the recycling truck struggling to navigate its way around the east side of Sempill Road, due to all the cars parking on the corner on the left. I have also seen many cars hit on the East side of Sempill, due to the poor visibility.</p> <p>Along with the additional cars from the new dwellings, will be the previous garage occupants, who will need to park their cars on Sempill Road, as other garages in the area may not be considered close enough for them to want to rent.</p> <p>Sempill Road needs widening to allow for the volume of traffic that we have daily, which includes the dustcart, lorries, emergency services and the endless amount of works traffic that this development will produce, if it goes ahead. Along with this, we need additional parking throughout the grass verges on Sempill Road., to ease the burden of the current parking situation and to allow for the additional cars that this development is going to create.</p>
<p>68 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>I'd like to strongly object to the council's proposal to replace the garages with 6 additional houses.</p> <p>Sempill Road must be one of the most crowded and overdeveloped areas in Hemel Hempstead with noticeable lack of green spaces. I was really surprised by the council proposal to use the last inch of available space to cram even more houses and people in this overdeveloped area.</p> <p>At present, there is a real shortage of parking on Sempill Road driven by the number of people living in the area. The proposal only provisions parking for the new dwelling, but I am asking where are all the people currently using the garages and the parking spaces around them going to leave their cars? The proposed development reduces the available parking spaces in the area which will make life for residents even more difficult.</p> <p>I also cannot agree with the council's justification for this development. Everyone can see the number of huge residential developments constructed and currently under construction in Hemel - near Apsley station, near Ebbens road, the whole new neighbourhood above London Road, multiple big buildings in the city centre and not to mention Maylands. The council have multiple opportunities to provide affordable housing than rely on building 6 sub-standard houses in the last available inch of space in one of the most overbuilt areas in town. With the continued construction I have not seen any improvements in others areas to correspond to the increase in local population - traffic - getting in and out of Hemel in peak hours, schools, medical services - how far is the nearest A&E and is this adequate for a town the size of Hemel Hempstead and the rate it's population is increasing? All</p>

	<p>questions the council need to start facing before trying to cram more people in.</p> <p>I feel that my strong objection to the proposal mirrors that of my neighbours and I sincerely hope that the council will withdraw this absurd proposal. I would strongly support the council if the proposal is to re-develop the garages into a park or an open green space that could benefit the local people and provide a much needed breath of fresh air in the area.</p> <p>Having gone through the parking survey, I am amazed how inaccurate the findings of that survey are. I am surprised how the report suggests that the increased strain of traffic and parking could be accommodated. I live on the western side of Sempill road and a look through the window on a weekend or at night not only I could not see an empty spaces but I see double or triple parking by the residents, meaning that occupancy is over 100%. In a manly family area, it is unrealistic the estimation that households will only have 1 car and that parents could park at great distances of their homes. As many of the other residents in the area, we are also concerned about the increase in traffic levels, most of the newer built houses have their main bedroom facing the road and I could definitely notice the increased traffic and noise since we moved in 5 years ago. All these issues together with the overdevelopment and the complete neglect of the area by the council will impact property values in the area. Together with my neighbours I believe that the council must start putting the interests of the residents first and stop treating as cash cows. I am completely opposed to this development and I am contacting my local MP and councillor to let them know about this as well.</p>
<p>69 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NQ</p>	<p>Object to this development. Will cause more stress on neighbours without adequate parking and no improved social infrastructure to support more people and vehicles in this area.</p>
<p>25 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposal of this development due to the current driving and parking conditions the residents of Sempill Road have to endure. Our road is so overpopulated and congested with cars that at times the only spaces available to park are on the pavement which is then a hazard and very dangerous to pedestrians or on a corner or bend which again has caused numerous collisions resulting in unnecessary damage to motor vehicles. The horrendous Sempill Road parking dilemma has obviously not been investigated, assessed or taken into consideration prior to this proposal, otherwise it would never have been put forward before offering us residents a solution, which in my opinion would be to remove all of the green bays in front of our houses, as doing this would give us the opportunity to park outside our own homes and even allow those who wish, to turn their front gardens into drives. I cannot see how this development can be considered or even go ahead without the true parking situation on Sempill Road is fully observed.</p>
<p>69 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NQ</p>	<p>The proposal is to demolish in total 46 garages on the 2 sites of Sempill Road. That would mean an extra 46 vehicles looking for parking on residential streets which are already full to capacity with many vehicles already parking on pavements. The extra traffic it would bring to one of the main routes into town from the dual carriageway would also</p>

	<p>massively increase further putting pedestrians including primary school children who walk to school at greater risk of being hit by vehicles which already use St Albans Hill as a race track</p>
<p>87 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9FW</p>	<p>Sempill Road in its entirety suffers from a lack of parking based on the number of properties already situated on the street. Despite the council increasing bay sizes this has had no effect on easing the issue. Adding additional properties at either end of the street will cause added strain to the situation.</p> <p>Access is already difficult with there being no passing places on either bend to allow for traffic to move in both directions easily. Adding construction traffic will make access even more difficult.</p> <p>There have been various accidents on the junctions over the last few months as a result of increased traffic and road closures on St Albans Hill. Access egress issues from the South end of Sempill Road onto St Albans Hill is currently High risk due to vehicles parking on or around the junction with St Albans Hill. There is already a blind spot in respect of oncoming traffic from the roundabout at Belswains Lane which is further exacerbated by frequent flooding. Additionally, traffic speed travelling from the ski centre makes it difficult for people wanting to exit Senlill Road. Improvements need to be made to the existing road layout before more properties can be considered otherwise it is likely further incidents will arise with the additional of construction traffic and the need for further road closures.</p> <p>The majority of properties in the street house children. Allowing more vehicles and construction traffic passing through the street increases the risk of accidents on an already busy road.</p> <p>Previous applications by residents to increase boundary lines for additional parking requirement have been rejected resulting in people parking on the highway, destroying land and making it impossible for delivery vehicles and emergency service vehicles to gain sufficient access to properties on the road.</p> <p>The proposed development will restrict current properties view leading a loss of light and having a detrimental effect to the privacy of existing residents at all angles. Construction noise will also have a negative impact on people due to increased home working.</p>
<p>77 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NQ</p>	<p>I object to this construction as it there are enough properties in this area, adding to it will add pollution, noise, traffic, schools are already oversubscribed, it is bad for the environment. I 100% object.</p>
<p>10 Ivory Court Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9YJ</p>	<p>With reference to the proposed development of Sempill Hill road. I cannot believe that you are planning to building more homes on this road, it's adsoluetely outrageous!! The planning of this has clearly not considered the road situation.</p> <p>Lack of parking. Even though the road has already had added more parking.</p> <p>All of the cars vans are Double parked allready.</p> <p>Steep hills on Both sides of access to Sempill that is not gritted and</p>

	<p>goes straight into a main road with blind corner, this is not safe for traffic coming down the hills because of the double parking on the corners of the road and danger that you may not stop adding more cars to this is suicide.</p> <p>. Cars backing on to a main road because of parking, this is a blind corner. Not safe for children at all to cross. .I have nearly been run over several times trying to cross with my dog as you can't be seen by traffic. .council do not cut the grass it grows to high and course even more danger to all our residents.</p> <p>. Emergency services not being able to access the road due to double parking.</p> <p>Children walking to and from school that can't cross the road safely because of parking.</p> <p>The wild life. we have a group of foxes that live in the road our residents like to see them foraging for food</p> <p>Refuge and delivery drivers all ready block the road stopping access</p> <p>.In the winter/ snow and ice make it hard to get access to our homes because of the steep hills both ends of Sempill Hill road so people park on st Albans Hill this cause even more danger. To add more homes is ludicrous.</p> <p>Hi . I am objecting to both ends of Sempill Hill road proposal. This really is the most crazy development idea! What with how the road has already been developed so many times . Not to mention the new build properties in Ebbans road, Apsley quarry also frogmore road. This is having such a traffic impact on st Albans Hill, The Albion road through Apsley . Surly we residents that live in Sempill Hill road and surrounding areas don't need any more development. safety must come first, such a huge impact on the environment in such a short over developed road already.</p>
<p>14 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>We strongly object to the proposed development within this planning app. As a resident of Sempill Road for the past 9 years, the parking has increasingly become worse during this time, even with the council's small effort to increase parking by removing some unused grass verges a couple of years ago. A simple supermarket home delivery vehicles causes chaos due to the single lane availability and lack of parking for the residents. Majority of houses along Sempill have AT LEAST 2 cars, but I would actually suggest the average to be closer to 3 per dwelling. We are also sharing our street with properties along St Albans Hill who have no driveways and feel it's safer to park along Sempill rather than park along the main road (which does not have any parking restrictions). There is no consideration for where the local residents who currently use these garages will now be expected to park their vehicles? Again</p>

	<p>further impacting the already limited parking.</p> <p>The proposed development, although has provisions for allocated parking, will not be adequate and it can be guaranteed that it will spill out into Ivory Court and Sempill Road.</p> <p>The construction phase of the development will also have significant and detrimental impact to Sempill Road & Ivory Court users. If both developments are granted and completed at the same time, what considerations have been made to the accessibility for vehicles entering/exiting the street? No doubt there will be obstructions caused by construction works in the form of heavy plant & machinery movements, partial road closures to complete utility connections, parking for construction workers, mess spilling out onto Sempill and noise disruption from the chaos this will cause.</p>
<p>41 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG</p>	<p>We live very near to the proposed development site and are writing to ask that Dacorum Borough Council refuse this planning application Sempill Road garages development x2: Public consultation 20/03735/FUL AND 20/03734/FUL</p> <p>Herein are our comments and objections relating to this planning application:</p> <p>Parking is already a contentious issue on Sempill Road in what is a very built-up area, with little to no on street parking. The demolition of 10 residential garages would force more vehicles onto the road and compound the issue on Sempill Road and also for residents that live along St Albans Hill that use this road for on-street parking. Residents rent those garages because of the lack of parking within this location.</p> <p>Sempill Road is already a busy and congested road; this additional concentration of traffic and lack of roadside parking will cause traffic problems and create a safety hazard for other motorists.</p> <p>Therefore, we ask that Dacorum Borough Council refuse this Planning Application.</p>
<p>10 Springfield close Croxley Green WD3 3HQ</p>	<p>I visit my son and daughter in law and since they have lived in Sempill Road this is becoming increasingly difficult for me. I am registered disabled and need to be able to park near to their home as I cannot walk far. However this is now impossible. I have to stop by their house and ask my son to park the car for me as the spaces are too far away. This new development is going to make the parking situation worse as more traffic will be on the road. The access to the road is dangerous as there are always cars parked on the corner and this completely blocks your view as you drive in and out of the road. There is enough development already in this road it really cannot take anymore. The overspill from the neighbouring roads is only going to get worse if this goes ahead. I feel this has been designed without any thought to how it will actually work by people who have no clue about the road apart from a short one morning. I strongly object to this proposal</p>
<p>30 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead</p>	<p>As a resident of Sempill Road for 20 years I would like to raise my objections to this development of 6 houses. I have also registered my</p>

Hertfordshire
HP3 9PF

objection to the other planning application for the development of 4 houses.

Despite letting the planning department know that the document relating to flooding on the development of the 10 garages by McCloy called the road SEMPILL, this has again been done for the this second development. I would have expected professionals to have spelt this correctly and for the council to have paid enough attention to have noticed this. I assume this is because the consultants and council planning staff are working from home and haven't dealt with this. Interestingly you get extra time to sort this out but the closing date does not change .

I would also like to point out that the applications for the development of the 10 garages and the 36 garages despite being loaded on to the website for public viewing on different days the closing date for objections remains the same, 4th January. Can please explain to me why this is the case? Also as we are currently experiencing a move into tier 4 as well as the Christmas holiday period why this has not be extended to allow for this? Considering Mr Ian Johnson informed me these applications would be on the website on 27th November the first applications didn't go on until 10th December. It was also not mentioned they would be two separate planning applications to make it even more laborious for residents to register objections. It seems odd to me that you can delay things without any just cause but you cannot extend a closing date.

The access into Sempill Road from St Albans Hill on both the east and west sides is extremely narrow and with the parked cars on one side leaves the road one car wide. Cars also have to park on the sharp bend opposite your proposed development, on the access road causing huge issues with visibility. As the road is not one way vehicles are constantly meeting each other head on and this forces one driver to reverse back. This is either up to the main part of Sempill Road or down onto St Albans Hill a very busy main road. This is extremely dangerous and has led to accidents. Yet on your plans you have no provision to alter this access or widen the road to address this. With more cars accessing the most awkward part of the road this is going to make the road even more dangerous.

I notice on your Design and Access statement the drawings clearly show cars parked on the road by the development but not on the access road to it. Do we assume that you are already aware that the parking will be inadequate and that cars will be parked on the access road to the new development?

As you will note on the grass verge on the left hand side of the road there are huge grooves in the grass (sadly you didn't take a picture of this). This is where the dust cart cannot get up the road due to parked cars and has to mount the kerb to get round. With more cars parking on this part of the road it will only make it more difficult for them to access.

You mention in your report that the main issue for the houses in St Albans Hill is being overlooked. Yet you fail to recognise the lack of

parking they have that impacts on Sempill Road. These houses do not have any off road parking which means that both west and east ends of Sempill Road are used by these house holders to park their cars. As you progress further into Sempill Road the residents of St Albans Hill have added gates in their back fences which allow them to park their cars in our road and then access their properties via this gate. Another factor your report has failed to take into consideration.

There is a small parking area at the back of the houses from St Albans Hill which is used as a pulling in space when two cars meet head on. Your plans do not indicate what will happen to this? I imagine the new houses will also think this is the perfect place for them to park and walk to their houses. Where will the residents of St Albans Hill park their cars if not behind their homes? Yet again Sempill Road

I also note you say these garages are under used. On speaking to residents in the road many confirmed they are currently renting the garage as they had nowhere to park. Indeed one neighbour has only recently began to rent a garage as he was so fed up not being able to park. Interestingly he was told this was a short term arrangement. Is this because you assumed this was a done deal with no objections from the residents because you hadn't told them?

Can you please explain where these extra vehicles will now park? Residents have also asked to rent garages but the cost was too high and the council would not reduce this and would rather they remain empty. Even if only 23 out of 46 garages (east and west) are currently occupied that will still mean an extra 23 cars parking in the road. Where do you propose they go?

Sempill Road has already been extremely over developed with the addition of multiple houses built in the back gardens of properties in Deaconsfield Road. Despite objections and petitions from residents the council went ahead with the assurance of adequate off road parking for the new builds. Sadly this has not been the case. Despite having the ability to park two cars on their driveways because some of them are not level these properties all choose to only use one space. This means the other vehicles are all parked in the resident's bays. The idea of one car per property is at best unrealistic. Currently all of the new build houses have more than vehicle including one house that has four cars and a milk float. Only one is on their drive.

Following more petitions we were able to get the council to remove some of the grass verges and turn them into parking bays. These were supposed to be for the residents of the houses which had no driveway parking. However as I have said these are being used by the residents of the new build properties. When the council put in the parking bays they did not paint any white lines indicating spaces. As the road is narrow cars park diagonally however, no lines means cars park at opposite angles and leave large gaps taking up even more parking spaces. Despite asking the council still will not put the lines in. I assume this is because of cost issues so again no thought to the current residents.

I wrote to Mike Penning MP in 2009 and asked him to help with our parking issues caused by the massive over development of the gardens of Deacons field Road and he contacted the council to raise

his objections. I have contacted him again to highlight this issue which is now even going to be even worse.

Your report on flooding indicates it will not be an issue as they have gone on line and seen there is no reports of flooding. However, I have contacted the Highways agency and the council as when it rains the water floods the drain by our house and pours down the hill. The highways agency refuse to come out as they do not consider this to be a problem and according to their records the drain does not exist. The cause of the flooding is the drain is blocked by builder's waste which was flushed down the drains by the developers when the new build houses were erected. The addition of more cars parking on the remaining grass verges means there is no natural drainage. Because of the amount of vehicles in the road when it rains the water collects at the bottom of the road where it joins St Albans Hill. I doubt this is ever reported and won't appear in online searches.

The provision of parking spaces per new build is inadequate despite it being the correct calculated amount. It is clear that they are to be family homes yet the expectation in today's world that a house hold will only have one car is ill thought out. Your recent development of flats in St Albans Hill is a prime example of where the allocated parking is completely inadequate. The car park is always full which means the residents are then forced to park on St Albans Hill outside of the flats entrance. This clearly shows your perfect ideal of one car per new build certainly does not exist so where will the overspill of cars park? Yes in Sempill Road on the main entrance opposite the original houses.

The residents of the original houses have repeatedly asked for the grass areas in front the blocks to be removed to provide more parking but have been told it's too expensive to do and maintain. Yet you will be gaining even more income from the renting/purchase and council tax on these properties. Some of this needs to be put back into the main road. Removing these grass areas will allow us to park our cars in front of our houses leaving space in the main road. Surely this is the answer to the problem we are and will continue to have if this development goes ahead. The claim regarding maintenance being an issue is irrelevant as the road has certainly not been maintained. At the moment we have pot holes in the road and in some of the blocks the brick wall is collapsing. Can you please provide us with a date you did any maintenance work?

The infrastructure and capacity of the road was never designed to take the massive increase in cars driving in and parking in the road. We have had the constant upheaval of pavements outside our houses being dug up to lay new cables/pipes etc. often causing issues with our own utility supplies. Pavements have been left uneven and dangerous.

We have already experienced the issues of builders lorries blocking the road, dirt and debris all over the road (I suffered two punctures caused by nails when the new houses were built) not to mention paths and road dug up to lay utility pipes this is going to be even worse with such large scale developments all at once. How is this going to be managed by the council? Is it right we will have months of upheaval yet again.

This new development is ill thought out and done without any understanding or knowledge of the existing road and the challenges the house holders face. Having lived in my house for 20 years Dacorum have only ever sought to add more and more houses, never amending the existing the infrastructure which cannot cope anymore. This once nice quiet road is now completely congested and not a nice place to live anymore. As per normal, the road has not been assessed at a time which clearly shows how the residents are struggling with access and parking. Something you need to address before making any final decision. While I understand the need for affordable housing this policy of putting houses in any space without any thought for the impact on the residents is not the way the council should proceed. It is time the council actually considered the house owners of the road and put their needs first. Had the council not allowed private developers to utilise the gardens in Deaconsfield road which means the houses have sold for large sums of money that puts them out of reach of many people, this need would not be such as issue.

I have emailed Martin Strickley photographs which show the issues the Road is facing. I would like to think that a planning officer will visit the site at a sensible time to actually assess the road and it's issues before proceeding.

I am completely opposed to this development and I have contacted my local MP and councillor to let them know about this as well.

I look forward to hearing from you regarding the next stages of this process

As a resident of Sempill Road for 20 years I would like to raise my objections to this development of 6 houses. I have also registered my objection to the other planning application for the development of 4 houses.

Despite letting the planning department know that the document relating to flooding on the development of the 10 garages by McCloy called the road SEMPILL, this has again been done for the this second development. I would have expected professionals to have spelt this correctly and for the council to have paid enough attention to have noticed this. I assume this is because the consultants and council planning staff are working from home and haven't dealt with this. Interestingly you get extra time to sort this out but the closing date does not change .

I would also like to point out that the applications for the development of the 10 garages and the 36 garages despite being loaded on to the website for public viewing on different days the closing date for objections remains the same, 4th January. Can please explain to me why this is the case? Also as we are currently experiencing a move into tier 4 as well as the Christmas holiday period why this has not be extended to allow for this? Considering Mr Ian Johnson informed me these applications would be on the website on 27th November the first applications didn't go on until 10th December. It was also not mentioned they would be two separate planning applications to make it

even more laborious for residents to register objections. It seems odd to me that you can delay things without any just cause but you cannot extend a closing date.

The access into Sempill Road from St Albans Hill on both the east and west sides is extremely narrow and with the parked cars on one side leaves the road one car wide. Cars also have to park on the sharp bend opposite your proposed development, on the access road causing huge issues with visibility. As the road is not one way vehicles are constantly meeting each other head on and this forces one driver to reverse back. This is either up to the main part of Sempill Road or down onto St Albans Hill a very busy main road. This is extremely dangerous and has led to accidents. Yet on your plans you have no provision to alter this access or widen the road to address this. With more cars accessing the most awkward part of the road this is going to make the road even more dangerous.

I notice on your Design and Access statement the drawings clearly show cars parked on the road by the development but not on the access road to it. Do we assume that you are already aware that the parking will be inadequate and that cars will be parked on the access road to the new development?

As you will note on the grass verge on the left hand side of the road there are huge grooves in the grass (sadly you didn't take a picture of this). This is where the dust cart cannot get up the road due to parked cars and has to mount the kerb to get round. With more cars parking on this part of the road it will only make it more difficult for them to access.

You mention in your report that the main issue for the houses in St Albans Hill is being overlooked. Yet you fail to recognise the lack of parking they have that impacts on Sempill Road. These houses do not have any off road parking which means that both west and east ends of Sempill Road are used by these house holders to park their cars. As you progress further into Sempill Road the residents of St Albans Hill have added gates in their back fences which allow them to park their cars in our road and then access their properties via this gate. Another factor your report has failed to take into consideration.

There is a small parking area at the back of the houses from St Albans Hill which is used as a pulling in space when two cars meet head on. Your plans do not indicate what will happen to this? I imagine the new houses will also think this is the perfect place for them to park and walk to their houses. Where will the residents of St Albans Hill park their cars if not behind their homes? Yet again Sempill Road

I also note you say these garages are under used. On speaking to residents in the road many confirmed they are currently renting the garage as they had nowhere to park. Indeed one neighbour has only recently began to rent a garage as he was so fed up not being able to park. Interestingly he was told this was a short term arrangement. Is this because you assumed this was a done deal with no objections from the residents because you hadn't told them?

Can you please explain where these extra vehicles will now park?

Residents have also asked to rent garages but the cost was too high and the council would not reduce this and would rather they remain empty. Even if only 23 out of 46 garages (east and west) are currently occupied that will still mean an extra 23 cars parking in the road. Where do you propose they go?

Sempill Road has already been extremely over developed with the addition of multiple houses built in the back gardens of properties in Deaconsfield Road. Despite objections and petitions from residents the council went ahead with the assurance of adequate off road parking for the new builds. Sadly this has not been the case. Despite having the ability to park two cars on their driveways because some of them are not level these properties all choose to only use one space. This means the other vehicles are all parked in the resident's bays. The idea of one car per property is at best unrealistic. Currently all of the new build houses have more than vehicle including one house that has four cars and a milk float. Only one is on their drive.

Following more petitions we were able to get the council to remove some of the grass verges and turn them into parking bays. These were supposed to be for the residents of the houses which had no driveway parking. However as I have said these are being used by the residents of the new build properties. When the council put in the parking bays they did not paint any white lines indicating spaces. As the road is narrow cars park diagonally however, no lines means cars park at opposite angles and leave large gaps taking up even more parking spaces. Despite asking the council still will not put the lines in. I assume this is because of cost issues so again no thought to the current residents.

I wrote to Mike Penning MP in 2009 and asked him to help with our parking issues caused by the massive over development of the gardens of Deacons field Road and he contacted the council to raise his objections. I have contacted him again to highlight this issue which is now even going to be even worse.

Your report on flooding indicates it will not be an issue as they have gone on line and seen there is no reports of flooding. However, I have contacted the Highways agency and the council as when it rains the water floods the drain by our house and pours down the hill. The highways agency refuse to come out as they do not consider this to be a problem and according to their records the drain does not exist. The cause of the flooding is the drain is blocked by builder's waste which was flushed down the drains by the developers when the new build houses were erected. The addition of more cars parking on the remaining grass verges means there is no natural drainage. Because of the amount of vehicles in the road when it rains the water collects at the bottom of the road where it joins St Albans Hill. I doubt this is ever reported and won't appear in online searches.

The provision of parking spaces per new build is inadequate despite it being the correct calculated amount. It is clear that they are to be family homes yet the expectation in today's world that a house hold will only have one car is ill thought out. Your recent development of flats in St Albans Hill is a prime example of where the allocated parking is completely inadequate. The car park is always full which means the

residents are then forced to park on St Albans Hill outside of the flats entrance. This clearly shows your perfect ideal of one car per new build certainly does not exist so where will the overspill of cars park? Yes in Sempill Road on the main entrance opposite the original houses.

The residents of the original houses have repeatedly asked for the grass areas in front the blocks to be removed to provide more parking but have been told it's too expensive to do and maintain. Yet you will be gaining even more income from the renting/purchase and council tax on these properties. Some of this needs to be put back into the main road. Removing these grass areas will allow us to park our cars in front of our houses leaving space in the main road. Surely this is the answer to the problem we are and will continue to have if this development goes ahead. The claim regarding maintenance being an issue is irrelevant as the road has certainly not been maintained. At the moment we have pot holes in the road and in some of the blocks the brick wall is collapsing. Can you please provide us with a date you did any maintenance work?

The infrastructure and capacity of the road was never designed to take the massive increase in cars driving in and parking in the road. We have had the constant upheaval of pavements outside our houses being dug up to lay new cables/pipes etc. often causing issues with our own utility supplies. Pavements have been left uneven and dangerous.

We have already experienced the issues of builders lorries blocking the road, dirt and debris all over the road (I suffered two punctures caused by nails when the new houses were built) not to mention paths and road dug up to lay utility pipes this is going to be even worse with such large scale developments all at once. How is this going to be managed by the council? Is it right we will have months of upheaval yet again.

This new development is ill thought out and done without any understanding or knowledge of the existing road and the challenges the house holders face. Having lived in my house for 20 years Dacorum have only ever sought to add more and more houses, never amending the existing the infrastructure which cannot cope anymore. This once nice quiet road is now completely congested and not a nice place to live anymore. As per normal, the road has not been assessed at a time which clearly shows how the residents are struggling with access and parking. Something you need to address before making any final decision. While I understand the need for affordable housing this policy of putting houses in any space without any thought for the impact on the residents is not the way the council should proceed. It is time the council actually considered the house owners of the road and put their needs first. Had the council not allowed private developers to utilise the gardens in Deaconsfield road which means the houses have sold for large sums of money that puts them out of reach of many people, this need would not be such as issue.

I have emailed Martin Strickley photographs which show the issues the Road is facing. I would like to think that a planning officer will visit the site at a sensible time to actually assess the road and it's issues before proceeding.

I am completely opposed to this development and I have contacted my local MP and councillor to let them know about this as well.

I look forward to hearing from you regarding the next stages of this process

Below is a copy of my email sent regarding the parking stress survey results

Dear Mr Stickley

I have been provided with a copy of the parking stress survey carried out by xxxxxx xxxxx from Mr xxxxxx

This makes interesting and yet inaccurate reading which unfortunately you will be unaware of as you have yet to visit Sempill Road.

Having gone through the document I felt it would be easier to list my comments against each point listed in the report. I would be grateful if you could respond to my questions and comments. I would also be grateful if xxxxxx xxxxxx could include any photo's they took on each evening so we can see where these empty spaces are in the road (I would certainly be moving my car closer to my home if such spaces existed!)

The constant use of the 400m guide line does not mean much too local residents and it would be extremely helpful if this distance could be clarified in the report by the use of a Sempill Road house number as a guide.

Point 1.3 - States that a number of comments were received from local residents. These comments came from houses the entire length of Sempill Road. Please can you explain why the survey only covers 400m?

Point 1.6 - States that the garages on the Western development are at 58.33% occupancy. In previous correspondence and in some of the objections, residents have commented that they had previously applied to rent these garages and been refused.

Point 1.18 - States the survey was to understand parking levels in the local area and yet failed to actually survey the entire length of Sempill Road. As the road is a semicircle which leads to no other roads, the whole road is affected by these developments.

Point 1.23 - States that DBC guidance to calculate parking capacity regarding the length of the bays. However none of the bays have any white lines marked as spaces for vehicles which results in reduced capacity due to poor parking. Photographic and video evidence of this has been submitted previously to Martin Stickley. Please also note no mention is made of the volume of commercial vehicles we have parked in Sempill Road (including a small lorry milk float which takes up two spaces or more each day) nor how have they been factored into the parking space ratio. Where vehicles are parked on grass verges, has this been included as parking spaces? Where cars are tandem parked (two cars in a vertical line) how has this been noted as parking spaces? Can you also please confirm that the small car park for the block of flats in Sempill Road was not included in the survey?

Point 1.24 - States that a distance of 400m was used. Please can Mr Stickley indicate where on the road (perhaps by house number) this actually goes too.

Point 1.25 - Shows a chart of spaces and occupancy. St Albans Hill is showing a total of 35 spaces. Please can Mr Stickley indicate where

exactly these spaces are as at each side of the entrance to Sempill Road and the part which runs parallel to it between Risedale and Leys Road there are NO off road parking spaces for the residents. NO house in this part of St Albans Hill has driveway parking. Cars are parked on the main road and pavement opposite the cars parked from Wellington House.

Point 1.25 - The survey concludes it is acceptable for a resident of Sempill Road to walk 400m to their home. I live at No 30 Sempill Road so can Mr Stickley indicate if I am forced to park my car in Leys Road, how many metres this is to my home.

Point 1.27 - This states that there are 16 garages to rent in close proximity to Sempill Road. Do you think it is acceptable to be offered a garage Deaconsfield Road, Wheelers Lane or Risedale Hill when this is a considerable distance from your home? Would you want to carry shopping, a small child or baby this distance?

Point 1.28 - This point assumes that any resident who has a car in the rented garages will rent one elsewhere. How can this possibly be known or estimated without speaking to those people. Therefore the figure of 14 displaced vehicles is completely inaccurate.

Point 1.30 - The displaced vehicle figure is envisaged. Therefore not be included in this report as it has no factual basis.

Point 1.33 - The Eastern development of 4 properties is estimated to have a car ownership of 2 cars. Clearly this again is inaccurate. We can assume that at least 2 of the 4 properties will be rented by a couple, it is reasonable to think they will have a car each. Therefore this figure again is not correct and is merely a "guesstimate" Evidence of the inaccuracy of these figures can be seen on the Wellington Court development where the flat owners do not have enough allocated parking and are parking along St Albans Hill causing major traffic obstructions.

Point 1.34 - Again on the Western development the estimate of cars each property will have is inaccurate. Sempill Road has suffered from "garden grabbing" and has new houses built the whole way along it. These houses have 1 allocated driveway space. Yet in one property alone they have 4 cars and a commercial vehicle. This would have been noted had the survey gone the length of the road.

Point 1.37 - This states that if 30 vehicles were displaced parking stress levels would rise to 92% but if only 14 cars are displaced this goes to 85%. Again how can these figures be used when you do not have accurate data from the renters of the garages. These figures should not be included in the report.

Point 1.38 - States they can see no reason why these applications should be refused due to parking.

Again I have repeatedly requested Mr Stickley that you come to the road one evening to see the challenges the residents face but NO ONE from the planning department will attend.

Sempill Road is a uniquely shaped road (a small semicircle) with steep entrances each side, unless you actually know and view the road, you can have no idea of the current difficulties residents face. This can clearly be seen by the fact that this report states there is parking for St Albans Hill residents but a short walk along the road would show the planning committee this is factually incorrect.

Yet again I urge the members of the planning committee and indeed Mr Stickley to view the road to see first hand our parking issues. Indeed this is why when Mr xxxx xxxxxx came late one wet evening he was

amazed at the issues we faced and was able to see the overcrowded and dangerous parking. Also I was able to point out things that have not been included in this survey, such as the St Albans Hill residents parking in Sempill Road and using their back gardens to access their homes. I had hoped this survey would accurately show the issues we are facing but yet again this is not the case. The planning committee needs to clarify the accuracy of this data before using this as part of the decision making process.

I look forward to your response

Kind regards

Below is a copy of my email sent regarding the parking stress survey results

Dear Mr Stickley

I have been provided with a copy of the parking stress survey carried out by xxxx xxxx from Mr xxxxx.

This makes interesting and yet inaccurate reading which unfortunately you will be unaware of as you have yet to visit Sempill Road.

Having gone through the document I felt it would be easier to list my comments against each point listed in the report. I would be grateful if you could respond to my questions and comments. I would also be grateful if xxxx xxxx could include any photo's they took on each evening so we can see where these empty spaces are in the road (I would certainly be moving my car closer to my home if such spaces existed!)

The constant use of the 400m guide line does not mean much too local residents and it would be extremely helpful if this distance could be clarified in the report by the use of a Sempill Road house number as a guide.

Point 1.3 - States that a number of comments were received from local residents. These comments came from houses the entire length of Sempill Road. Please can you explain why the survey only covers 400m?

Point 1.6 - States that the garages on the Western development are at 58.33% occupancy. In previous correspondence and in some of the objections, residents have commented that they had previously applied to rent these garages and been refused.

Point 1.18 - States the survey was to understand parking levels in the local area and yet failed to actually survey the entire length of Sempill Road. As the road is a semicircle which leads to no other roads, the whole road is affected by these developments.

Point 1.23 - States that DBC guidance to calculate parking capacity regarding the length of the bays. However none of the bays have any white lines marked as spaces for vehicles which results in reduced capacity due to poor parking. Photographic and video evidence of this has been submitted previously to Martin Stickley. Please also note no mention is made of the volume of commercial vehicles we have parked in Sempill Road (including a small lorry milk float which takes up two spaces or more each day) nor how have they been factored into the parking space ratio. Where vehicles are parked on grass verges, has this been included as parking spaces? Where cars are tandem parked (two cars in a vertical line) how has this been noted as parking spaces? Can you also please confirm that the small car park for the block of flats in Sempill Road was not included in the survey?

Point 1.24 - States that a distance of 400m was used. Please can Mr Stickley indicate where on the road (perhaps by house number) this

actually goes too.

Point 1.25 - Shows a chart of spaces and occupancy. St Albans Hill is showing a total of 35 spaces. Please can Mr Stickley indicate where exactly these spaces are as at each side of the entrance to Sempill Road and the part which runs parallel to it between Risedale and Leys Road there are NO off road parking spaces for the residents. NO house in this part of St Albans Hill has driveway parking. Cars are parked on the main road and pavement opposite the cars parked from Wellington House.

Point 1.25 - The survey concludes it is acceptable for a resident of Sempill Road to walk 400m to their home. I live at No 30 Sempill Road so can Mr Stickley indicate if I am forced to park my car in Leys Road, how many metres this is to my home.

Point 1.27 - This states that there are 16 garages to rent in close proximity to Sempill Road. Do you think it is acceptable to be offered a garage Deaconsfield Road, Wheelers Lane or Risedale Hill when this is a considerable distance from your home? Would you want to carry shopping, a small child or baby this distance?

Point 1.28 - This point assumes that any resident who has a car in the rented garages will rent one elsewhere. How can this possibly be known or estimated without speaking to those people. Therefore the figure of 14 displaced vehicles is completely inaccurate.

Point 1.30 - The displaced vehicle figure is envisaged. Therefore not be included in this report as it has no factual basis.

Point 1.33 - The Eastern development of 4 properties is estimated to have a car ownership of 2 cars. Clearly this again is inaccurate. We can assume that at least 2 of the 4 properties will be rented by a couple, it is reasonable to think they will have a car each. Therefore this figure again is not correct and is merely a "guesstimate" Evidence of the inaccuracy of these figures can be seen on the Wellington Court development where the flat owners do not have enough allocated parking and are parking along St Albans Hill causing major traffic obstructions.

Point 1.34 - Again on the Western development the estimate of cars each property will have is inaccurate. Sempill Road has suffered from "garden grabbing" and has new houses built the whole way along it. These houses have 1 allocated driveway space. Yet in one property alone they have 4 cars and a commercial vehicle. This would have been noted had the survey gone the length of the road.

Point 1.37 - This states that if 30 vehicles were displaced parking stress levels would rise to 92% but if only 14 cars are displaced this goes to 85%. Again how can these figures be used when you do not have accurate data from the renters of the garages. These figures should not be included in the report.

Point 1.38 - States they can see no reason why these applications should be refused due to parking.

Again I have repeatedly requested Mr Stickley that you come to the road one evening to see the challenges the residents face but NO ONE from the planning department will attend.

Sempill Road is a uniquely shaped road (a small semicircle) with steep entrances each side, unless you actually know and view the road, you can have no idea of the current difficulties residents face. This can clearly be seen by the fact that this report states there is parking for St Albans Hill residents but a short walk along the road would show the planning committee this is factually incorrect.

	<p>Yet again I urge the members of the planning committee and indeed Mr Stickley to view the road to see first hand our parking issues. Indeed this is why when Mr xxx xxx came late one wet evening he was amazed at the issues we faced and was able to see the overcrowded and dangerous parking. Also I was able to point out things that have not been included in this survey, such as the St Albans Hill residents parking in Sempill Road and using their back gardens to access their homes. I had hoped this survey would accurately show the issues we are facing but yet again this is not the case. The planning committee needs to clarify the accuracy of this data before using this as part of the decision making process.</p> <p>I look forward to your response Kind regards</p>
<p>86 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9FW</p>	<p>We strongly object to the proposed development plans on Sempill Road, due to, among other things, the overcrowding already evident on the road, risk of accidents due to traffic congestion, the devaluation of our properties and the restrictions of our property rights.</p> <p>Sempill Road is already a severely congested area with limited parking as many of the properties do not having driveways and heavily rely on trying to find roadside parking on Sempill Road, both on the roadside, in the carpark and at the garages. Adding additional properties at either end of the street will cause added strain to the already limited situation and increase the likelihood of road traffic incidents. Access is already difficult and extremely dangerous at times with there being no passing places on either bend to allow for traffic to move in both directions easily.</p> <p>Also, what will the financial impact on property values? As new homeowners, we have worked very hard to be able to buy our own homes and do not rely on any council or social housing schemes. We find it totally unacceptable that these proposals could have a negative impact on our homes both financially and otherwise and yet it took the time and effort of local residents to inform others of the plans which will have a substantial effect on us all.</p>
<p>Flat 2 Windsor Court Corner Hall Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9AW</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I wholeheartedly object to this planning application. The plans have been put together with little thought or consideration for the existing local residents, or the residents that the development will bring to the area.</p> <p>Firstly, parking on Sempill Road is already horrendous and poorly planned. Poor planning from the council when these houses were built didn't take into consideration the increased car ownership that has been seen over the course of the last few decades. Cars are now strewn all over Sempill Road, often blocking footpaths and resulting in pedestrians, including elderly people and children, having to use the road to walk past parked cars. This is a direct result of poor parking provision on the existing site, not even taking into consideration the new proposed development, that will actively remove parking, and fail to replace it. This will increase the health and safety risks to pedestrians and local residents who will be forced to park in precarious positions, as well as use the road to walk. Residents from the wider</p>

area are already parking on St. Albans Hill, Sempill Road and the junction between the two, it is currently a real hazard to road users and pedestrians. Additionally, I believe access to Sempill Road will be so effected, emergency vehicles such as fire engines and ambulances may struggle to navigate the road when all the cars are parked on the street at night. The development proposed by the council will only enhance this hazard.

I would also like to raise the health and safety issues that any development work will have on the local residents. There are a number of elderly residents and children who will live within close proximity of the site. Where is heavy machinery going to be kept? Where are building materials going to be kept? It is going to be a health and safety nightmare and should the work go ahead, it would be a calamity for the council if someone got injured given the number of objections being raised with very valid concerns for peoples safety. The council would be 100% responsible.

Also, the noise pollution will be considerable. In a time where people are actively being told to work from home due to Covid-19 there are increased numbers of people doing just that. Their work life and ability to their job will be negatively effected due to noise pollution with heavy machinery and building work on their front doorstep. The plans being put forward by the council are actively going to effect peoples ability to work from home and encourage people to go back to offices and making unnecessary journeys.

Also, the removal of grass areas to enable the development will increase water run off from rain and snow. The area is already prone to flooding with heavy rain and with the removal of grass areas the run off of water from the top of Sempill Road will be considerably more. The development will increase the level of road flooding on St. Albans Hill.

In summary, these are ill conceived plans by the council with very little thought for local residents, new residents and a total disregard for peoples quality of life, as well as increasing hazard and health and safety risks that may well result in someone getting seriously injured, be that from the development work itself or the increased traffic and parking.

I would implore these plans to be reconsidered and a better, more beneficial development be considered at a more open space where the council will actually be able to provide housing with a good quality of life, rather than shoehorning in several houses to an already overpopulated area, negatively effecting all that live there.

<p>79 Sempill Road, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, HP3 9FW</p>	<p>It is with disappointment that I am writing to you to object to planning application: 20/03734/FUL and 20/03735/FUL. I object to these applications on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due consultation and notification processes have not been followed. 2. Inadequate considerations of parking and road safety impacts. 3. Ecology report does not consider impact on all local wildlife in the area. 4. Development design does not follow the Sempill Road development plan. <p>Outlined below are further details of my specific objections and concerns with the proposed development.</p> <p>Not following due consultation and notification processes as outlined under The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.</p> <p>The above-mentioned order clearly outlines the notification processes and procedures that must be followed for planning applications, unfortunately in the case of applications 20/03734/FUL and 20/03735/FUL these processes have not been followed. As a local resident I pass the proposed developments most days. At no point has a sign been visible for the period of 21 days outlining the proposed development. Furthermore, I do not believe that all impacted neighbourhood residents have been engaged. It was only by chance that I became aware of this development through a conversation with neighbour and as an effected party by the development I am disappointed not to have been contacted by the council planning office considering the development. I therefore do not believe there has been the necessary engagement, notification and consideration of neighbours views to complete and effective neighbourhood consultation. It is also disappointing to see that the consultations period is being run in tandem with a period where residents are under a tier 4 lockdown and are not able to meet to discuss the proposal together. I therefore request that planning considerations are delayed until such point that the correct and due process can be followed effectively.</p> <p>Inadequate considerations of parking and road safety impacts</p> <p>The planning application inadequately considers the impact the development will have on parking and road safety of Sempill Road. Parking on Sempill Road is already a problem that Dacorum Borough Council are aware of and attempted to address with the construction of additional parking spaces. This attempt to address and existing issue was inadequate and has actually made the parking situation worse as cars now park half in and out of the bay extensions previously provisioned. This impacts me as a resident as I can no longer exit my vehicle from my drive way without crossing on to my neighbours drive way. In effect if my neighbour uses their drive way my vehicle is actually blocked in due with protruding vehicles. This is not the only case on the road of congestion causing vehicles to be blocked in and you can</p>

frequently see double parked and blocked in cars across on the road. The removal of the garages from the road and the provisioning of additional housing which will in turn bring more vehicles to the road will only exacerbate the existing issues impacting the area.

The Supplementary Planning Document Development Brief for Deaconsfield Road (Sempill Road) 2005 clearly identified such risks associated with developing Sempill Road. Firstly, the report outlines in section 4.27 that Sempill Road is too narrow for parking to take place on both sides of the street but increasingly this is happening and vehicles are parked on front lawns and council owned grass areas due to the overcrowding of parking (photos can be provided if necessary). Sections 4.28 & 4.24 outline both that a new footpath would be implemented and that street parking would be designed such that parking would not dominate the street scene neither of these have been maintained in the plan and they now represent a safety issue on the road. Cars are frequently parked on corners creating blind corners in which there have been accidents, young children have to cross roads between parked vehicles to get between their houses and a public foot path. Increasingly there are long wheel based vehicles on the road including vans and commercial vehicles that obstruct the highway. It should also be noted that residents on St. Albans Hill who do not have a parking provision without blocking their road frequently park on Sempill Road which further strains the road parking. Emergency vehicles and council refuse services have to block the whole road when servicing the area as do commercial deliveries.

Development that has taken place to date has over saturated Sempill Road, this can clearly be seen based on a survey of the area being performed on a weekday evening or weekend when the a majority of residents are at home you can compare this back to the parking photos in the 1991 Sempill Road Development Plan. Clearly the demolition of the residential garages will only make this problem worse. It would be more appropriate to make use of this land to alleviate the current parking issues on the road and improve road safety and the to use the land for further development. Statements that the garages have "become either disused or underused" in the planning application are inaccurate and if this is the case the land should be used not for housing development but to create parking for existing residents of St. Albans Hill/Sempill Road which I understand has been requested by other residents, who have also requested access to make use of garages.

Ecology report does not consider impact on all local wildlife in the area

The developers Ecology report does not consider all local wildlife in the area, it has made no mention of the local foxes that will be impacted by the development. As you will be aware foxes are classed as wild animals and not pests. The council has no statutory powers of legal rights to eradicate foxes on private or other land. Given report does not even mention local wildlife that the many residents are aware of and frequently see, I do not believe this survey has been performed with the necessary care and attention to the local environment.

Development design does not follow the Sempill Road development plan

The proposed development design does not meet the Sempill Road development plan of 1991 which states in section 4.29: "If the area of land to the rear between 120-122 Deaconsfield Road and rear of

	<p>97-103 St Albans Hill comes forward for redevelopment, alternative parking provision must be made on-site, to compensate for the loss of the garages." Simply put the designs do not adequately compensate for the demolition of even 10 of the 46 garages that are being removed under the two plans, instead the properties are provisioning parking for the residents on the new properties. Furthermore the development plan states that off street parking that is provided for the properties must be located behind the building line which is not the case in these designs and is not in line with existing property developments in which drive ways have been provisioned for off-street parking. As a result section 4.28 is being contravened which means that car parking is dominating the street scene.</p> <p>I kindly request that planning permission should be denied until such time that the above issues addressed.</p>
<p>45 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>Having been informed of your plan's for Sempill road . I have been living here for 45 years seeing car's taking over making parking a problem .The planned building is just crazy more car's and no spaces. No Driveway's lost parking when new houses came along , most of them have 2 or more cars reducing spaces. The best way to describe Sempill road is a FULL CAR PARK. Scary what you have Planned with no thought for the Residents. My car is in a garage I have rented for a good few year's. So with your plan's car's from garage's will park in Sempill Madness. WE NEED SPACE'S NOT MORE HOUSES AND CARS.</p>
<p>49 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>Access and parking already very problematic. What consultation has occurred in relation to the plans? Inadequate parking/turning. Noise and disturbance.</p>
<p>7 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG</p>	<p>Very concerned about loss of local garages and parking space in this area. Adjacent St. Albans Hill Road is already subject to dangerous parking and further overload will only make this worse... a dangerous accident waiting to happen, on also a highly used pedestrian paved area.</p>
<p>31 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG</p>	<p>I have recently moved to 31 St Albans Hill, (30.10.2020) and had no knowledge from my solicitor as to these proposals. I am extremely concerned as to the impact this will have on the already congested parking on Sempill Road.</p> <p>Properties on St Albans Hill have no where to park except at the back of their properties and this will be taken away plus all the difficulties of larger construction lorries accessing this area. As I know from recent experience with my removal lorry.</p> <p>Cars will take to parking on the St Albans Hills Road which they have already started to do which in my opinion is very dangerous especially coming from the bend to go up the hill, I have already seen cars swerving to miss large puddles at the bottom of Sempill Road. The footpaths are very narrow and pedestrians would also be put at risk.</p>

	<p>Further consideration needs to be given to the Council and Private properties and their parking needs prior to any rebuild in this area. Which will just result in further issues with regards to traffice, refuse collections etc.</p> <p>I am in full support of my neighbours comments (No. 39) with regards to the disgraceful time frame you have given the current community and apparently limited amount of properties in the area which have actually been informed of your development plans and that an extension should be given and full transparency to every property who surround this area.</p>
<p>7 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>Whilst I do not object to the building of these homes. I do not think you have considered the impact of extra parking on the local residents. Come and visit the area any evening or weekend and you will see that as of today there is NO extra parking that cold take the extra cars being evicted from the garages, plus any extra cars over and above that of the new spaces you are providing, plus the residents of St Albans Hill that also park here. Sempill Road, because of its layout does not lend itself to ease of parking, there is considerable waste of space. We currently have cars and vans parking of bends which cause accidents due to speed and visibility issues. We need more parking facilities to ensure that the new homes do not impact the safety of the area due to too many cars.</p> <p>With ref to the above application. Whilst I do not object to the building of the new dwellings, I do object to the plans for the provision of parking spaces.</p> <p>Sempill Road is very badly designed and does not offer enough parking spaces to the current residents. Removing these garages will add extra burden and frustration to an already over used space.</p> <p>Not only will the people currently using the garages need to find space, but also the residents of St Albans Hill.</p> <p>For this application to go ahead, you must provide us with a far better option for parking than currently exists in your plan.</p>
<p>9 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>There seems to be no provision for those people who use the garages for their vehicles, only barely enough for the properties planned (you can guarantee these properties will have on average x2 vehicles each). Parking is already very difficult on Sempill Road, without the displaced vehicles from the garages and any further visitors to the road.</p> <p>The area/road is already fully loaded with properties which have been built at the side/length of Sempill Road, plus the properties built on allotments in Ivory Court (several years ago). The area does not need any more properties!</p>

37 St Albans Hill
Hemel Hempstead
Hertfordshire
HP3 9NG

Below are my concerns, recommendations and general objection to the proposed garage site development proposals to create social housing dwellings on Sempill Road. There has been a severe lack of community awareness and consultation on the proposals with planning documents being submitted for approval at the worst possible time during the middle of a pandemic, festive holiday period, Tier 4 restrictions where mixing with neighbours to discuss the plans is forbidden by the Government and as another insult to injury many of the council members who have a deciding role on the matter are on annual leave and will be returning on the deadline day for comments which seems very convenient in the favour of the council.

It is completely unacceptable behaviour to try push these plans through for approval by taking advantage of the current situation we face. In addition it is outrageous how there has been a lack of communication and general disregard to the garage tenants who have not been made aware they may be evicted from their unit which some have been using for 35 years in some cases. It is also clearly obvious that lack of consideration has been given to the community and its needs, the difficulties faced living in the area and other infrastructure issues that need to be improved as a whole.

It seems very short sighted to contract architects and surveyors who are unlikely from the ward to design these plans that you are proposing. I do recall seeing them in the area without understanding at the time what tasks they were undertaking. They spent a very short time making their decisions which quite frankly are far from adequate and I personally feel I can make a far better proposal than what has been proposed by these so called professionals.

I am making sure that the community are fully aware of your underhand tactics and rallying support for everyone to comment online and contact the decision making committee by email, along with the local ward councillor, the local MP and media. It will not be tolerated on how you wish to make a congested over developed community even worse with no consultation or regard for all that live here and highly recommend to all to:

OBJECT, OBJECT, OBJECT!!!!!!

Road Access

Sempill Road is very narrow on both ends that junction with St Albans Hill with residents having to park predominantly along one side of the entire length of road end to end. This includes parking on the turning bends where both developments are being proposed, parking on grass verges, at diagonals, doubling up and in some cases tripling up in parking bays. The planning application document titled Design And Access Statement even shows on the cover page a computer generated image of how narrow the road is with parked cars to one side with a car travelling in the the opposite direction with no room for another vehicle to pass by, this is indicative of the current situation let alone when additional dwellings and more vehicles come to the area. In essence already recognising the current congestion on the road yet looking to bring more chaos to the area. IF these plans are approved when large construction vehicles try to enter/exit the development sites

this will cause road blocks with other passing residents, motorists and unfortunately where and when needed the Emergency Services. The current congestion on the road makes it difficult for standard sized vehicles to pass one another when meeting head to head resulting in having to reverse to a passing point where possible, performing a U-turn at given points of the road can be impossible and when faced with site vehicles such as a demolition waste grab truck how will motorists be able pass by as no doubt the driver in the much larger construction vehicle will either:

(a) Feel they do not have to give way being in the the larger more dominant vehicle. A mentality I am sure you can relate to of drivers of large vehicles. Also in their eyes they have a job to do and no regards for the residents and general public and how their obstructions are affecting us on which will be a daily basis during construction

(b) May find it difficult to reverse along Sempill Road due to the parked cars congestion or dangerously reverse out onto St Albans Hill in blind conditions as they will not be able to see passing traffic in both directions

It will not be feasible and will be strongly objected against if parking on Sempill Road is restricted during the construction works which I imagine will be a considerable length of time to maybe 6 months or more, there will be nowhere else for residents to park and as we all pay our Road Tax I believe we all have a right to park as close as we can to our homes. Also there is a risk from these large site vehicles causing damage to the parked vehicles as they pass by on the narrow sections of the road which may result in the car owner being unable to identify the 3rd party who damaged the vehicle and gain insurance settlement/compensation. How will a situation such as this be monitored to identify which driver in which vehicle may have unintentionally caused damaged to private property due to the size of the vehicle they are driving without realising it?

Parking

Sempill Road is already a congested area with limited parking as none of the properties from No25-55 St Albans Hill have off street parking and heavily rely on trying to find parking on Sempill Road (West), within the car park area by the current existing garages and on the surrounding roads. I imagine it is the same scenario for the householders by the East side. The St Albans Hill residents have to live in a harmony with the Sempill Road residents so that we can all try to park our vehicles as already detailed above. Parking is one of the most documented reasons for neighbourhood disputes. I can not understand how by removing 36 garages and creating 14 bays purely for the new dwellings where the council are expecting the current garage tenants to find suitable parking spaces when they have become reliant to store their vehicles in the garage when not in use? I do not see how the area can absorb this influx of additional vehicles along Sempill Road or surrounding roads. I imagine the Ivory Court residents will find that they will be completely congested with cars that currently do not park there. I would like to know when the architects that designed this proposal did an assessment on the road to understand vehicle density and parking conditions and what their observations where, what time of day this

occurred, did they conduct multiple assessments at different times of the day and over different days of the week and was this during or after Lockdown 1.0 or Lockdown 2.0 when traffic conditions on the road will greatly vary depending on residents ability to either travel to work, shopping and visit households within their bubbles?

Through word of mouth I have come to understand that there is an opinion that the garages are underused. I would like to see evidence of this? In Nov 2019 I personally made enquiries on the Dacorum website to rent a garage unit and I was unable to find any vacancies and I registered myself on a waiting list, too this day I still have not had a notification of a vacant unit. In fact I do not recall there being any vacant garages across Hemel Hempstead and was forced to rent a unit through a 3rd party company in Woodhall Farm, a distance of nearly 4 miles from my home. In addition it has very recently come to light that not all local residents have been made aware of these proposed plans and that a neighbour two doors away from me who has been renting a garage for some 35 years now was not even advised by the council of the proposed plans. I was extremely appalled by this complete disregard for garage tenants who have relied on parking their cars securely for such a long period of time every single night. The retired household were completely shocked and devastated as they are unable to park outside their house due to double yellow lines and the heavy traffic that passes along St Albans Hill, an area already congested due to over development from the demolition of Lime Kiln public house to construct 3 blocks of flats where the provisioned parking area is inadequate and the residents park on the main road causing issues for the residents living on the opposite side (planning ref 4/02371/07/MFA). By demolishing the 36 garages there is a concern that those tenants and residents will be forced to park where possible on the pavements of St Albans Hill making it even more difficult and dangerous for passing pedestrians especially parents with young schoolchildren and the travelling motorists.

Furthermore from the proposed plan I see that parking bays for Plots 4-6 will be created across location of the bottom 2 garages. This will create even further loss of parking for 3-4 cars for the local residents as right of access will have to be given to these parking bays. Something the architects may not have noticed on their site visits depending on how busy the car park was on the day.

Residential Property Values

What will the impact be on residential property values? Many of us have worked hard to be able to buy our own homes and do not rely on the council for social housing schemes or benefits. I find it totally unacceptable as do many others that these proposals could have a negative impact on our homes in these difficult times as well as the other issues and concerns that are being detailed with no compensation given to us. How would you decision makers feel if this proposal was happening on your very own road and had a financial impact on you? I am sure you would be feeling exactly how we do if you were honest to yourself! If there is a need to build then sell the land to a private developer who will build private residential properties and not affect us property owners!

Collection Bin Point

In the current proposed plan there is reference to a new bin collection point which is by a public access path. I would like to clarify if this is going to block the existing access for the public as it a popular route used to Deaconsfield Road to Apley and towards the town centre? Also how do you propose that the refuse bin trucks will access this point as when vehicles are parked in the car park the point of entry from Sempill Road will be very narrow for large vehicles, there is just enough room for standard vehicles to pass. I find it hard to imagine a truck being able to reverse into the area to collect the bins.

Loss of Light/Neighbouring Privacy

I have a concern that Plots 4-6 will impact the light in my rear garden which currently is not obstructed from a SW direction to which the garage site lies (especially in the summer months), this is also a concern for No31 where this development will be exactly behind the owners property, in addition there is also a concern on privacy due to windows potentially overlooking our rear gardens. The view from my rear garden towards the garage site which is not obstructed. There has been no assessment for window heights and line of sight into residential properties as the garage site is of higher ground to our properties so it is a concern how we will be affected.

Impact to Wildlife

Within this area there is numerous wildlife that may living around the garage site area that could be impacted by this development. In the planing application document Ecological Assessment there is no mention of the community of foxes that live within metres of the garages from what I have observed, they are regularly seen scrounging for food in the area. Also there is a significant number of birds of prey living in the immediate area, they could be nesting around the garage site as well as other species such as hedgehogs and bats which I have observed this year.

Traffic Control

There is a concern of large vehicles exiting from the West development onto St Albans Hill of an accident occurring. There is a tendency from motorists who are travelling from the Belswains Lane/Lawn Lane roundabout to quickly accelerate up the hill around a blind corner and this could result in an accident with large heavy vehicles slowly pulling out of Sempill Road. I believe it would be worthwhile for speed monitoring to occur before any development plans are approved to validate this concern and once they are proved valid to introduce traffic calming measures as appropriate, for example as implemented on St Albans Road and Queensway.

Rainwater Drainage

During heavy rainfall the storms drain are inadequate to cope with the rainfall as they are clogged up and do not drain away any surface water (possibly from previous construction work on Sempill Road when new dwellings have been erected and the sites were not sufficiently cleaned by the constructor and left to dissolve into the drains which eventually caused them to be ineffective as clogged with soil, sand and other building materials). This creates a stream of water running down Sempill Road towards St Albans Hill, as a result the road floods which

is a danger to pedestrians and passing motorists. Vehicles travelling up the hill have to divert to the other side of the road to avoid the flood water which reaches above the pavement level, this causes issues for residents living up the hill from me such as No39, 41, 43. In addition the planning application document Drainage Strategy states that excessive flood water will be anticipated to exit onto Sempill Road which will as stated cause flooding on St Albans Hill and on Page 7 of the Dacorum Borough Surface Water Management Plan it states that St Albans Hill is Hotspot 26 and the recommended actions of "Ensure highway gullies are suitably maintained and cleaned after larger storm events" are not implemented which can be confirmed by the local residents.

Proposed Revised Plan

Taking all the above points into account I have my own thoughts on a revised layout plan that I would like to be taken into consideration for the 'West' community area as a whole for parking and areas highlighted for traffic calming and rainwater drainage. From the small number of local residents I have been able to contact they have all be in agreement with my thoughts.

(1) Parking bays for Plots 4-6 are moved to be in front of the new dwellings. Currently there is a small plot of land that is not in use neither is it regularly maintained by the council. It would make more sense to create parking here which will then not affect the current car parking area and the new residents will then have easier access to their front doors with shopping, young children, pets, mobility aids etc.

(2) By moving the proposed parking bays to the front this creates flexibility to change the design for the location of Plots 4-6, they could possibly be positioned closer to the parking area therefore creating space in between the 2 sets of buildings that could create a child play area for the local community and possibly a better bin collection point

(3) To create off street parking for the existing residents thereby creating a more open plan less congested Sempill Road for residents and site traffic before construction begins. This would be a significant benefit to all concerned. There are 3 lots of land that again are not regularly maintained by the council and could be used more beneficially to the community:

(i) Plot of land adjacent to my property which I maintain at my own effort and cost (as the grass cuttings fill my green bin which I then pay through my council tax to be taken away as part of my own waste collection) this could be converted too off street parking with dedicated parking for No37 & No39 St Albans Hill and additional communal bays

(ii) Plot of land adjacent to No31 St Albans Hill to create 2 dedicated bays for that property

(iii) Plot of land on the opposite side of Sempill Road from the garages that would benefit the residents adjacent with off street parking. By

	<p>creating these bays there will no longer be the option to park on the road due to dropped kerbs and therefore keeping the road clear, open and congestion free for construction and residents for decades to come</p> <p>In addition to point 3, with extensive development being undertaken at the moment across Hemel Hempstead with numerous blocks of flats being built at Apsley Quay, Two Waters Road and adjacent to The Forum building including a little bit of unused land into the development plans to create off street parking should not be rejected without consideration which would help ease the congestion on the West side to some degree. Also it is my understanding that this public highway land and the land that Sempill Road dwellings are built upon were once land and allotments that belonged to the houses of St Albans Hill and Deaconsfield Road and that it was acquired to be built upon, so there has been significant and over development for housing in the area over the past few decades and by providing off street parking as part of this development plan is effectively giving the land back to the properties that it originally once belonged too.</p> <p>Whilst there is an appreciation for housing across the country to continuously develop in congested and dense areas can not be tolerated. It may be more suitable to reduce the numbers of proposed dwellings, retaining a number of terraced garages for residents use whilst addressing parking and other residents concerns which may be more of an acceptable proposal to the community.</p> <p>To reiterate my earlier comments the local residents do feel that the planning office are trying to take advantage of the current pandemic situation, lockdown restrictions and the festive period by submitting a late application before Christmas and imposing a deadline of the 4th Jan 2021 for comments. As a result I have reached out to Sir Mike Penning MP and local ward councillor on this matter for assistance.</p> <p>I trust that all the points and supporting information I have provided will be reviewed by the appropriate planning and decision making members and that the bigger picture for improving the community is appreciated and that a number of these concerns will also be relevant to the East garage site development proposal 20/03735/FUL.</p> <p>From a very unimpressed and disappointed resident,</p> <p>RC</p>
<p>27 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG</p>	<p>We would like to raise our objections to this development of 6 houses. Our concern is regarding parking spaces. Households have on average two cars but parking spaces are going to be developed only for one car per house.</p> <p>The new development will contribute negatively to already overcrowded on-street parking and will also affect the parking behind our house.</p> <p>From what I can see, there are still 6 parking spaces taken from a car park where we use (behind 27 St Albans Hill) and these 6 spaces are allocated to new houses. If there are enough parking spaces overnight</p>

	<p>within 400m as per your study, I strongly object to allocating 6 spaces to new properties. There should be a fair chance to park for everyone. New residents can also walk 400m to their car.</p>
<p>25 Ivory Court Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9YJ</p>	<p>The Design & Access Statement notes in the pre-application that the development has been subject to consultation with near-neighbours. Plots 1-3 are directly opposite our property and the letter dated 14/12/2020 is the first mention of this development that we have been made aware of.</p> <p>There are a handful of queries that have not been mentioned or considered as part of the planning application documents that we would like clarification on;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What consideration has been made to the loss of light to the front of our property during winter months? - Has a swept path analysis been undertaken on the 6 no. parking spaces in front of Plots 1-3? The road out the front of our property is in regular use for on-street parking for our and other properties and there is a risk the development restricts the ability to park on the road - Further clarification on the construction period and coordination of access for materials and plant? Will the primary access be opposite our property? Reference made above to our on-street parking? - Connection of utilities? The Drainage Strategy advises connection directly onto Sempill Road. What consideration has been made for connection of communication and power utilities? There is a BT chamber directly in front of our property, will works require to encroach onto our drive?
<p>Thornhill Barnes Lane Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9LA</p>	<p>NOTIFICATION Poor communication with the residents of Sempill Road and St Albans Hill. Only a limited number received postal notification these proposals and many residents reported that they were completely</p> <p>PARKING Parking on north side is treacherous in the Winter due to the slope when parking in icy conditions disallow parking for fear of sliding down and across the road. In really bad weather cars, vans etc can't drive up Sempill so we they park up all along St Albans Hill. Congestion of cars at peak times make the bend dangerous to navigate. Cars park on the bend which makes visibility 'around the corner' impossible. It would appear that there are numerous 'abandoned' cars left. Despite these being reported Dacorum have made no attempt to remove them.</p> <p>At times when cars or vans drive up or down Sempill, it's a blind bend</p> <p>There are more than 100 houses on Sempill Road and a further 28 houses on the northern side of St Albans Hill with no spaces for parking at all. These residents park in the southern recesses on Sempill Road and gain access to/from the rear of their own properties. With only 150 on-road and off-road car parking spaces this amounts to only 1 space per dwelling. When larger work vans further limit spaces this falls to below 0.8 private car spaces per dwelling.</p> <p>CONGESTION Congestion on Sempill Road at west and east is already very poor due to the cars parked on the bends thereby making the road effectively a</p>

	<p>narrow single carriageway. Cars having to reverse up/down the hill on the bend has resulted in numerous accidents. There have also been a series of incidents with cars reversing back onto St Albans Hill. incidents. Residents with larger vehicles present even more problems are precluded.</p> <p>Large public service vehicles have great difficulty navigating the narrow road at either end caused by cars parked on a single side of the Road.</p> <p>Larger construction vehicles will further exacerbate the existing conditions.</p> <p>unaware of notices on the surrounding lampposts.</p> <p>OVER DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Houses on the northern side of Sempill Road have parking for 2 spaces but due to the cars parking behind each other some residents parking on the other side of the road, putting more pressure on available spaces.</p> <p>FLOODING</p> <p>Sempill Road currently floods St Albans Hill due to drains being blocked. Dirt and debris from construction will further block any open drains.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE AND POLLUTION</p> <p>There is no indication that increasing the number of houses by 10% in Sempill Road will increase the infrastructure of the area by any means. With so many increased vehicle movements every day the impact on pollution is likely to be significant. With Dacorum Borough Council's 's pledge to reduce carbon emissions this development will do nothing to contribute to this target.</p> <p>SUMMARY</p> <p>Sempill Road is extremely congested at all times of the day and evening. The impact of losing a total of 46 garages and a potential increase in further 20 cars to be parked will have a massive negative impact on living in this area.</p> <p>The principal issue for this area is the lack of available parking. Suggestions for improving parking include:</p> <p>Diagonal indicative lines would help with more efficient parking by residents.</p> <p>Repair the low walls in the 3 parking recesses areas.</p> <p>Extend and formalise the parking in the recesses particularly the northern most space.</p>
<p>48 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>I don't want more flats in our area I find it hard enough to find a parking space and I need one as of disabilities</p> <p>Also would be concerned about noise and the flats don't go with the houses around this road also I need the garage which is there, also it is right behind my garden so I will not get privacy.</p>
<p>90 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9FW</p>	<p>My wife and I are challenging this application for the following reason:</p> <p>At 4pm Friday 1 Jan 2021 I counted 108 cars parked on roadside and hardstanding including 7 cars parked on the hardstanding behind the St Albans Hill houses. The parking in Sempill Road has become a hazard as cars park at the junction of Sempill Road and St Albans Hill end and at the top corner which makes passing difficult as visibility is a problem. The development will create more parking problems during demolition</p>

	<p>of the garages during building work, especially for the residents at the West end of Sempill Road. Where will the garage users park their cars when these are demolished? Once the houses are built, there will be more traffic flow and longer term more parking problems</p> <p>Also we will experience more problems due to road blockages when recycling vehicles, delivery vans need access. There is no room to pass due to parking and this problem will increase in future years.</p> <p>We are opposed to this development as it will create major parking and access problems in Sempill Road.</p>
<p>24 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>After reading your proposals and looking at the colourful drawings, you have not taken into account the parking on the hills and bends at either end of Sempill Rd or the bays. I also noted that it said close to major road and rail transport links.</p> <p>For years the Council have not listened to residents objections but totally ignored them.</p> <p>The site of Ivory Court, was once allotments, held in pertuity, objections were raised and ignored.</p> <p>The housing built onto the rear gardens from Deaconfield Rd into Sempill Rd, objections were raised and ignored. Tree's that had preservation orders on them were removed, houses built without any consideration to the parking situation, as those properties also park on the road. Additionally, residents from St Albans Hill now park in Sempill Road. The parking has now become intolerable. There have been numerous near misses, and several accidents, due to the parking issues on the bends at either end of Sempill Rd. Now you want to empty the garages to allow development. WHERE DO YOU EXPECT THEM TO PARK?</p> <p>Over the Christmas period and during the present covid situation, Sempill Rd had no parking spaces anywhere, and that vehicles were now parking along St Albans Hill causing traffic problems for other road users, but that pedestrians have to walk in the road to pass them.</p> <p>As for the wildlife it appears you don't care. The tree's that were removed housed a lot of wild life. I used to have Squirrels and 11 different bird types in my garden during the day, and hear owls at night, now I am lucky if I get any. At present there are 2 Fox dens in Sempill Rd, I have video proof of them everynight, in addition numerous resident witnesses, they keep down the vermin population, I know where the dens are. Ignorance of the area is not an excuse, to destroy wildlife with a stroke of a pen.</p> <p>There are 2 foot path's one at either end of Sempill by the garages, 1 gives access towards the local school, will they still be open during and after (if development goes ahead).</p> <p>Someone has been to Sempill Rd to observe the parking situation, I can supply video or photographic evidence if required.</p>

	<p>If the development does go ahead (I sincerely hope not) where will the contractors heavy machinery park, but also the contractors vehicles. Will this mean that parking on the hill sections be banned and if so WHERE will they park. Please could you give a honest answer to the problem that over development has caused.</p>
<p>15 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG</p>	<p>This proposed development will seriously affect the safety of an already hazardous part of Sempill Road. Where Sempill Road bends down hill to meet the junction of St Albans Hill is already seriously overcrowded with parking and is often hazardous to negotiate and to see oncoming traffic from both directions, leading to near collisions. Losing the overspill parking adjacent to the existing garages to this development will force even more local resident an other vehicle parking onto this stretch of road. I urge the planning committee to re-think this development on the grounds of public safety.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Mr Chris Quinn, local resident.</p>
<p>18 Sempill Road HP3 9PF</p>	<p>I have been informed by one of my neighbours in Sempill Road of the proposed developments on the garage sites, I have not received any notification from the council re this, should not all residents have been informed of this in a timely manner to be able to raise any questions or objections? I have been unable to raise my questions via the Dacorum website due to IT issues.</p> <p>I have various concerns about the development please see points listed below:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking - the demolition of 46 garages will bring more chaos for parking in an already heavily congested area, at the moment I'm lucky if I manage to get parked anywhere near my house. Parking is at a premium and it is unclear how the area will absorb this extra influx of vehicles as a result of no longer being able to park in the garage unit. 2. Impact to Residential Property Values - what will construction of social housing do to property values as well as further reduction in parking spaces. From my point of view I can only see this affecting the resale my property in a negative way. 3. Road Access - simultaneous on both ends of Sempill Road will create traffic flow congestion due to the large site vehicles that will be involved in demolition and construction. 4. Rainwater Drainage - Sempill Road currently floods St Albans Hill due to drains being blocked and the dirt and debris from construction will further block any open drains. 5. Construction Disruption - large site vehicles will cause roadblocks on both sides of Sempill Road which is already narrow from car parking congestion. 6. Over Development - the area has been heavily developed from what

	<p>was once gardens and allotments.</p> <p>7. Impact to Wildlife - ecological assessment shows for example no record of community of foxes in the area as well as danger to other animals.</p> <p>8. Improvements Required to Local Infrastructure to support such new developments.</p>
<p>19 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG</p>	<p>Garages "disused or underused" = This amenity has not been maintained in a fit-for-use state by its owner - DBC!</p> <p>'Access Plan' makes no mention of the addition of construction or additional resident traffic at the difficult Sempill West to St Albans Hill junction.</p> <p>'Car Parking to policy standards' - what about the existing dwellings? Existing parking is over-subscribed - how is this addressing the parking standards. The Council's own planning brief for Sempill Rd states 'Sempill Road is too narrow to accommodate increased levels of on-street parking'.</p> <p>There has been a lot of housing development in the area in recent years. The need for social housing is not new. Is the stated need for additional social housing not an indication that DBC has let developers get away with too few such dwellings in the recent schemes on St Albans Hill, Ebbens Rd and Frogmore Rd? This wouldn't constitute a justification for the loss of amenity, inconvenience and additional risks from street / pavement parking.</p> <p>The role of a planning system surely encompasses increasing the amenity of an environment rather than making it even more dysfunctional.</p> <p>The handling of this : the neglect of the existing garages; the absence of notice to the majority of the affected houses and the short consultation period (particularly in the context of the Covid restrictions) combine to give an impression of sharp practice designed to sneak something unpalatable and unjustifiable past residents. Additional response to the Parking Survey</p> <p>I must continue my objection to this application and challenge the validity of the parking survey - largely on factual and fairness grounds.</p> <p>The 'method statement' indicates that the normal approach would be to consider spaces within a 200 metre radius of the site and that, because of the proximity of the two Sempill Rd sites, a radius of 400 metres from a central point was used in this case.</p> <p>It is a matter of basic geometry that the area of a circle of 400 metres radius is four times that of a circle of 200 metres. As the the distance between centres is less than 400 metres, the circles for the West and East Sempill sites would intersect. This means that the apparently</p>

reasonable approach taken in the survey would more than double the area considered for alternative parking - compared to applying the normal 200-metres radius to the two sites individually.

Taking a 200-metre catchment for either of the sites' parking, a resident would not be expected to have to go more than 400 metres to reach an alternative parking space identified in the survey. The method taken here increases that to 550 metres.

In an average case, a resident adjacent to a site would have to go up to 200 metres to reach an alternative parking space identified in a survey. This special method increases that to 350 metres.

There is a basic requirement to treat people fairly. The residents in and around Sempill Road would be treated significantly less favourably than they would be if the two sites were considered separately - each with a 200-metre radius for alternative parking spaces. Such an approach would clearly increase the 'parking stress' produced by the survey and, at least, significantly weaken a case for approval.

The issue of 'double counting' could easily have been addressed by assigning the spaces in the intersection of the two 200-metre circles to the two sites in proportion to the number of surveyed cars or dwellings in each. This is not rocket surgery and I can't see why this was not done.

Double counting - what about the citing of alternative garage spaces in garages that now have permission to be demolished. These are within 600 metres of the centre of this survey, so presumably some of the alternative parking identified for those garages will also have been included as alternatives for the Sempill schemes - hardly a consistent approach.

The map in Appendix B shows kerb parking either side of the access to the 'informal parking' off the western end of Sempill Road. Inspection of the proposed site plan shows that such parking would block access to the 8 new formal spaces shown in that area.

This map seems to show that the survey didn't include the up to 10 cars parked in the 'informal parking' off the western end of Sempill Road. The plan shows no other parking in that area, so the 10 or so vehicles would be displaced - taking 10 of the 12 'spare' spaces on Sempill Rd.

The map shows kerbside parking spaces on St Albans Hill - either side of the western end of Sempill Road. Residents largely refrain from parking in this area of the road during the day and I strongly suspect that the adjacent double yellow lines would soon be extended on safety grounds if these spaces were occupied more frequently.

It continues to be clear to me that the proposed scheme would reduce the parking provision for existing residents and visitors from the already challenging levels. It would also mean parking would overspill into more

	<p>dangerous areas (at least until the double yellow lines are extended into them).</p> <p>The development would also increase traffic on the effectively narrow Sempill road and lead to more reversing and maneuvering as vehicles traveling in opposite directions attempt to pass each other. This would inevitably increase pollution and reduce safety for motorists and pedestrians.</p>
<p>33 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9PF</p>	<p>I am a homeowner on Sempill Road and am objecting to the proposal of demolition of garages and building of houses on Sempill road at both proposed garage sites. This application in practice would result in over development of the road and area and overload the parking and traffic situation in this area.</p> <p>Sempill road was not built to handle this proposed over development, Sempill road was originally 61 houses the council have seen fit to allow this to increase to 104 properties coming from the majority of Deaconsfield road houses selling off part of the rears of their properties gardens to be turned into housing on Sempill road, houses 62 - 104. Whilst the council planners also didn't enforce that the housebuilders for houses 62 to 104 make all houses have to have driveway parking for 2 cars minimum and instead just 1, most households have 2 cars and many households multiple vehicles so now these extra vehicles are on Sempill road. You also have the fact that Sempill road is used for parking for many St Albans hill households as they do not have driveways or road parking. The garages which are currently used by vehicles these vehicles would then need to park on Sempill road if garages demolished. The new houses would bring more vehicles than the 1 parking space you are giving these 2/3 bed houses. Sempill road also is used by some Ivory court households for parking. Also looking at the plans some current areas of parking behind St Albans hill houses off Sempill road would be removed again these vehicles would then want to park on Sempill road. Put all these things together and it should be clear that the road is already at maximum and these plans would clearly result in overdevelopment of the road and overload the parking and traffic on the road as clearly the plans reduce current parking and increase vehicles onto the road.</p> <p>There has already been previous requests by Sempill road residences for the council to provide more parking on the road, suggested was taking out the 3 middle section greens/grass areas on the road and replacing with a driveable surface which would allow driveways and additional parking to ease the strain on Sempill road. As households these days have multiple vehicles. Yet the council said no at the time and now see fit to try and increase the number of vehicles on the road by planning 10 houses and reducing/removing current parking and garage parking this is madness.</p> <p>I also object to these planned houses as clearly they are not in keeping with the area and will result in a loss of privacy and light to many properties on sempill Road, st albans hill and ivory court.</p> <p>Also please be aware that many peoples comments section objections are objecting clearly to both planning proposals, the 6 house on the 36</p>

	<p>garage site and 4 houses on the 10 garage site even if only commenting in the 36 garage/6 houses page. so please process these objections rightly to both plans on Sempill road. I am appalled that you would separate these two plans when they are clearly linked. I am appalled that you have only posted to a small percentage of houses any information regards these plans in the area and has only been by chance I found out these plans but then I am sure if you had written to all relevant houses on Sempill, st Albans roads and ivory court you would get a resounding objection. Also as mentioned by others and I agree to have these plans up for such little time to be opposed or seen is not right at anytime but definitely not during tier 3 and 4 restrictions on movement and secondly the fact that so many people involved are not available for questioning and off for Christmas/new years involved in this regards the council and planning is very wrong.</p>
<p>15 St Albans Hill Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9NG</p>	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of notice to local residents 2. Too large - will increase local parking congestion 3. Dangerous road - too narrow with current level of parking 4. Dangerous road - blind bends 5. Dangerous road - turning in from St Albans Hill has to be very slow to avoid single lane oncoming cars 6. Parking will be pushed onto St Albans Hill - already always parked illegally with no action taken (pavements always obstructed denying access for buggies and wheelchairs and buses required to manoeuvre around causing congestion and additional pollution. 7. Decrease in parking for St Albans Hill residents (no other options) <p>8. Pavements only in one side of the road with dropped kerbs already blocked</p> <p>9. Grass verges parked on reducing greenery and water soak away</p> <p>10. Increased vehicles means higher air pollution</p> <p>Suggestions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce number of houses built thus excess cars 2. Turn residual area into green space with lots of eg fruit trees to absorb carbon emissions of cars and provide local fruit 3. Make road one way - reduce risk of collisions 4. Improve parking along the whole road 5. Incorporate solar panels in roofs and other eco measures again to balance more carbon <p>In general, town planning in Hemel is very poor with regard to the pedestrian. Please make this a priority.</p>
<p>82 Sempill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9FW</p>	<p>I object to this firstly for the parking in the area. Parking on Sempill Road is very difficult which causes a lot of issues. Vans and cars have to park on the corners which make it very dangerous travelling along the road as you cannot see. This development will add to this issue .</p> <p>This will also had increased traffic along the road. Cars often speed along this road which makes it dangerous due to visibility issues and</p>

	<p>especially when there are a lot of children living on the road. It will also have impact on the local environment and animals and birds that live in the area.</p>
--	---