

**ITEM NUMBER: 5**

|                               |  |                |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------|
| <b>21/00441/OUT</b>           | <b>Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the development of 4 dwellings on land north of Pickford Road, Markyate.</b> |                |
| <b>Site Address:</b>          | <b>Land SW Of Frindles Cheverells Green Markyate Hertfordshire AL3 8AB</b>   |                |
| <b>Applicant/Agent:</b>       | <b>Land and Partners South East Ltd</b>  |                |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>          | <b>Colin Lecart</b>  |                |
| <b>Parish/Ward:</b>           | <b>Markyate Parish Council</b>   | <b>Watling</b> |
| <b>Referral to Committee:</b> | <b>Contrary view of Parish Council</b>   |                |

**1. RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 That planning permission be GRANTED.

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 The site is located within the rural area outside the village of Markyate. The council cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply and thus the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2019) is engaged. When assessed against the policies contained within the Framework as a whole, as well as any relevant policies contained within the council's development plan, it is considered the principle of the development is considered acceptable.

2.2 The site is not located within the Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the Green Belt, or a Conservation Area. Therefore there are no clear policies within the Framework that protect areas such as these that provide a clear reason for refusal of the development.

2.3 The application is for outline planning permission with all matters reserved other than the means of access. The proposed access is considered acceptable by Hertfordshire County Highway Authority. Issues relating to appearance, layout, scale and landscaping are reserved matters. Based on the indicative plans provided, as well as supporting information, it is considered the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area nor the residential amenity of the surrounding area.

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

3.1 The site comprises an open field used for the grazing of livestock on the north eastern side of Pickford Road. The site is bounded on three sides by mature hedgerows. The larger field of which the site is a part of is also enclosed by a hedgerow on the north eastern boundary.

3.2 The site is located along a stretch of road defined by existing ribbon development which leads into the village of Markyate. Varied development of a mixed age and scale are located either side of the road. Stretches of modern detached generic dwellings are interspersed with older buildings.

3.3 The site is located within a designated rural area but outside the Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Green Belt. Listed Buildings are located on the opposite side of the road at Little Cheverells and The Granary. Cheverells Green to the front of the site is designated as a Local Wildlife Site and a Rights of Way runs adjacent to the site.

**4. PROPOSAL**

4.1 The application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved except access for the development of 4 dwellings on land north of Pickford Road, Markyate.

## 5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications:

20/01538/OUT - Outline planning (all matters reserved) for 6 dwellings with new access point from Pickford Road  
*WDN - 18th November 2020*

## 6. CONSTRAINTS

Special Control for Advertisements: Advert Spec Contr  
CIL Zone: CIL2  
CIL Zone: CIL3  
Large Village: Markyate  
Parish: Markyate CP  
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Red (10.7m)  
Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Markyate)  
Rural Area: Policy: CS7  
Parking Standards: New Zone 3  
EA Source Protection Zone: 3  
Wildlife Sites: Cheverell's Green

## 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

Main Documents:

### **National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)**

Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)

Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

Core Strategy:

NP1 - Supporting Development  
CS1 - Distribution of Development  
CS7 - Rural Area  
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design  
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design  
CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS17 – New Housing  
CS24 – The Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
CS26 – Green Infrastructure  
CS27 – Quality of the Historic Environment  
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction  
CS31 – Water Management  
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality

Local Plan:

Policy 18 – The Size of New Dwellings  
Policy 21 – Density of Residential Development  
Policy 54 – Highway Design  
Policy 79 – Footpath Networks  
Policy 97 – Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
Policy 99 – Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands  
Saved Policy 199 -  
Saved Appendix 3 – Design and Layout of Residential Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020)  
Affordable Housing Clarification Note (2019)  
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)  
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)

## **9. CONSIDERATIONS**

### Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;  
The Impact on the Surrounding Area  
The impact on residential amenity; and  
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

### Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located just outside the formal village boundary of Markyate. The adjacent property of Frindles to the north east is formally located within the village boundary as well as development on the opposite side of the road. The site is therefore located in a designated rural area outside the village where Policy CS7 would apply with respects to the Rural Area. This policy states the small-scale development for housing within the rural area will only be permitted at Aldbury, Long Marston and Wilstone. The site is not located within these areas.

9.3 However, It is generally accepted that Dacorum Borough Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year supply of housing land to meet the requirements under paragraph 73 of the NPPF (2019). This has been confirmed in appeal decision APP/A1910/W/19/3237997 and in the committee report for LA3, Land West of Hemel Hempstead (4/03266/18/MFA). Thus, the tilted balance in favour of sustainable development contained within the NPPF would be engaged. The strategic elements of Policy CS7 would be considered out of date with regards to Paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

9.4 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that where it can be demonstrated that there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date planning permission should be granted unless

- i) *the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- ii) *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against policies in the framework taken as a whole.*

9.5 It is noted that the site is located outside of the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, does not comprise ancient woodland and is not at risk of flooding. It is not within a conservation area and does not significantly affect the setting of any heritage assets.

9.6 Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside. The ruling within *Braintree v SSHCLG [2018]* set out that the decision maker must consider whether the development would be physically isolated, in the sense of being isolated from a settlement. The issue of what is a settlement or whether the development would be isolated is a matter of planning judgement. It is clear Markyate would comprise a settlement, as it is allocated as a large village within the development plan. While the site sits just outside the formal village boundary, the adjacent property as well as properties on the opposite side of the road are all included within the village boundary. It is considered that the site is no more isolated from the village than the existing ribbon development along the road. The site is not physically isolated from the village and future residents would have adequate access to local services and amenities found within the settlement.

9.7 Paragraph 77 of the NPPF states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It is also recognised that opportunities for villages to grow and thrive should be identified, especially where this would support local services.

9.8 Allowing new housing in suitable and sustainable locations will contribute to the vitality and viability of the local community through increasing the number of people in the village who are likely to use the local shops and services helping them to stay open.

9.9 The applicant has referenced The Taylor Review (2008) and 'Strong Foundations'. Meeting Rural Housing Needs – making rural communities fit for the future' (2018) by The Country and Business Association (CLA) which place an emphasis on taking a better balance of social, economic and environmental factors together to form a long-term vision for all scales of communities. In this sense, a broader view of what sustainable development is should be considered.

9.10 With regards to the above, the site would be a 9 minute walk from the centre of Markyate. Walking into the village is feasible but it is noted that it is equally likely future residents of the properties are likely to rely on travel by car. However, it should be noted that Section 9 of the NPPF which focuses on sustainable transport states that **significant** development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. The proposal is not considered to be significant in nature and represents a limited form of development which would promote the vitality of the village through increased social and economic participation by future residents. Biodiversity net gain can also be achieved on site which would form an environmental benefit associated with the proposal. Section 9 also states "opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making". In this sense, it is considered the lack of public transport options available within the immediate vicinity would not represent a reason to refuse this form of limited development in this location.

Notwithstanding the above, it would still be feasible for residents to walk into the village if required, and appropriate cycle storage would make cycling a feasible option as well.

9.11 It is noted that a number of potential land allocations in and around Markyate feature within Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038) with respect to housing supply. However, the plan is not at an advanced stage and so only limited weight can be given to this.

9.12 When taking into account all the above, it is considered the principle of development in this location is acceptable. The council's strategic housing policies are considered to be out of date and the site is not within the AONB or the Green Belt. The application is for outline permission with issues relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale being reserved matters (to be assessed at a later stage). The below will assess the scheme on the indicative site plans submitted, as well as additional supporting documentation.

### Impact on Surrounding Area and Listed Buildings

9.13 Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) state that development should not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Policy CS27 states that the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of designated and undesignated heritage assets will be protected.

9.14 This stretch of Pickford Road consists primarily of low density ribbon development in the form of detached dwellings. A sense of openness is maintained on the street scene before the density of development rises to the north west. The site is flanked by mature hedgerow on three sides, with the wider field of which it is a part being bounded by another hedgerow to the north.

9.15 A previous six unit scheme which indicated two terraced blocks of housing under application 20/01538/OUT was withdrawn. This proposal has reduced the scheme to what has been indicated as four detached properties. The detached nature of the scheme is considered more sympathetic to the surrounding development and profile of the street. Its indicated linear layout also integrates with the surrounding developments. The spacing between the properties appears to be close to the spacing seen north east and south east of the site, as well as the general density of the existing development which leads into the centre of Markyate.

9.16 Furthermore, the existing hedgerow along the front boundary of the site would screen the proposed dwellings to a large extent. Any views from the road of the ridgelines of the properties, or slot views through to their front elevations would be seen in context with development on the opposite side of the road as well as the to the north west. The properties would also be positioned approximately 27-29m away from the front boundary which would further reduce their prominence from the road and thereby maintaining a sense of openness to the street scene.

9.17 The site is not located within a conservation area but there are two Listed Buildings located on the opposite site of the road, Litter Cheverells and The Granary.

9.18 A heritage statement was submitted with the application. While parts of Little Cheverells are glimpsed in views from Pickford Road the proposal was considered to cause no harm to the setting of the heritage asset due to the natural screening that exists between the application site and Little Cheverells. With respects to the Granary, it was considered that there would be no visual harm to the setting of this heritage asset.

9.19 The conservation officer was consulted and raised no in principle objection to the development. The officer noted the full design details would be awaited within any follow up reserved matter applications and a full assessment could then take place. Overall, the proposal would comply with

policies CS11, CS12 and CS27 at this stage. Further design and landscaping details would be assessed on follow up reserved matters applications.

#### Impact on Residential Amenity

9.20 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon the neighbouring properties and their amenity space.

9.21 It is considered the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy due to the siting of the proposal and the screening that exists along the boundaries.

9.22 The garden depths of the properties would exceed the requirements of Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004). Future residents would also have good access to the open countryside due to the rights of way adjacent to the site.

#### Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.23 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy states that on each site development should provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users.

9.24 Furthermore, Saved Policy 51 of the Local Plan (2004) states that the acceptability of all development proposals will always be assessed specifically in highway and traffic terms and should have no significant impact upon the nature, capacity and use of the highway network and its ability to accommodate the traffic generated by the development and the environmental and safety implications of the traffic generated by the development.

9.25 The council's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020) contains the car parking provision requirements for different types of developments.

9.26 Issues relating to access are to be fully considered through this outline application, as the only matter not reserved for later approval.

9.27 Hertfordshire County Council Highway Authority were consulted on the application and had no objections to the proposal subject to conditions. A transport assessment was submitted in support of the proposal and it was noted by the highway officer that "*the applicant has clearly illustrated that the required visibility splay of 2.4 x 43 metres can be achieved in drawing C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2001 which HCC is pleased with. The applicant has proven that large vehicles such as fire appliances and refuge vehicles can manoeuvre on site in order to exit and the enter the site in forward gear, this can be seen in drawings C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2001, C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2002 and C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2003. HCC is satisfied that these drawings are accurate and illustrate that the dwellings can be accessed via the appropriate services*".

9.28 Overall, the proposal would not have a significant impact on the safety or operation of the adjacent highway. A number of conditions will be placed on any permission given in relation to the access.

9.29 Layout, which would include the parking layout and provision is a reserved matter. However, the application has indicated that the proposal would provide two three bed room units and two four bedroom units. Under the standards set out within the Parking Standards SPD (2020), 10.5 parking spaces would be required. The proposed site plan indicatively shows that 12 spaces would be provided, including the four garages. The proposed garage dimensions and parking spaces

indicated on the plans would comply with the requirements of the SPD. Details of electric vehicle charging provision will be secured by condition.

### Other Material Planning Considerations

#### *Affordable Housing*

9.30 No affordable housing provision would be required on this development with regards to the Affordable Housing Clarification Note (2019).

#### *Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Rights of Way*

9.31 Policy CS24 of the Core Strategy (2013) requires the special qualities of the AONB to be conserved. The site lies outside of the Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty, though is located in close proximity to it.

9.32 A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal. This document considered that the site in its current form does not contribute to the localised or wider landscape or townscape setting. The character assessment that forms part of the LVIA concludes that the site is more closely influenced by its proximity to the existing urban features such as the adjacent existing development, road and power lines, which provide an edge of settlement feel to the site.

9.33 No objection is raised to the above findings as it is considered that the site would not be widely visible in long range views from the AONB due to the low lying topography of the land and existing hedgerows along the boundaries. Upon entering the field at either the northern or southern ends of the site along the Rights of Way, one would view the proposal within the context of Pickford Road and the surrounding development, including associated infrastructure such as the existing power lines and poles.

9.34 The existing rights of way that runs adjacent to the site will be retained and as such diversion is not required. A 2m wide footway will tie with the existing footway on the northern side of Pickford Road and the public right of way running along the eastern boundary of the site. It will ensure a safe and continuous pedestrian route exists between the site and the village of Markyate whilst also maintaining the integrity of the right of way.

#### *Trees and Landscaping*

9.35 An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted in support of the application. The tree officer has no objection to the proposed development. The tree protection details contained within the submission will be conditioned should planning permission be granted. Landscaping is a reserved matter to be assessed at a later stage.

#### *Ecology*

9.36 Cheverells Green to the front of the site is a local wildlife site. The proposed access would be positioned over some of this site. Hertfordshire Ecology have not commented on this application. However, they were involved in discussions with the applicant's ecologists on application 20/01538/OUT. Discussions took place regarding the principle of 10% biodiversity net gain being achievable on the site. On the 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2020, Hertfordshire Ecology confirmed that agreement had been reached and that "all ecological constraints would be removed from this outline application and it can be determined accordingly". This from the officer's understanding, is because agreement had been reached that 10% biodiversity net gain could be reached on site.

9.37 Conditions relating to the submission of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) and Lighting Plan will be attached to any permission given with regards to Hertfordshire Ecology's comments on the previous proposal.

#### *Drainage*

9.38 The Lead Local Flood Authority were consulted on the application and had some concerns over the deep bore infiltration results contained within the applicant's drainage strategy. Some clarification over the modelling and calculations in terms of whether the site can accommodate the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event and achieve half drain down times within 24 hours.

9.39 It was noted that the LLFA are not statutory consultees on this application, due to it being for less than 10 units. Thus, the LFFA advised a pre-commencement condition in relation to the further information sought should the development be granted outline consent. This condition will be attached to any permission given.

#### *Contamination*

9.40 The scientific officer was consulted on the application and recommended conditions relating to the submission of an environmental risk assessment and any other follow up risk assessments and remediation strategies that may be required following this.

#### *Archaeology*

9.41 A Desk Based Archaeological Assessment has been submitted with the proposal. Hertfordshire Archaeology have not been consulted on this application, but it is noted that the desk based study is the same as that which was submitted on the previously withdrawn proposal.

9.42 In response to the previous proposal, the archaeology officer requested conditions relating to the submission of a Written Scheme of Investigation. These conditions will be attached should planning permission be granted.

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

9.43 The application is CIL liable if it were to be approved and implemented. Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on 1 July 2015. No CIL form has been submitted as the application is for outline consent. CIL liability would be calculated at reserved matters stage once detailed plans are submitted.

## **10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 The council cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply and thus the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2019) is engaged. When assessed against the policies contained within the Framework as a whole, as well as any relevant policies contained within the council's development plan, it is considered the principle of the development is considered acceptable.

10.2 The site is not located within the Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the Green Belt, or a Conservation Area. Therefore there are no clear policies within the Framework that protect areas such as these that provide a clear reason for refusal of the development.

10.3 The application is in outline form only with access to be determined. The proposed access is considered acceptable by Hertfordshire County Highway Authority. Issues relating to appearance,

layout, scale and landscaping are reserved matters. Based on the indicative plans provided, as well as supporting information, it is considered the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area or the residential amenity of the surrounding area.

## **11. RECOMMENDATION**

11.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**3631.201 Rev F**

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

- 4. Tree protection fencing shall be installed prior to and during the construction phases of the development hereby permitted in accordance with plan 422-03 contained within the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Arborterra Ltd). Further protection measures shall be carried out in accordance with Section 3 (Method Statement) of the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment.**

Reason: In order to ensure that damage does not occur to trees and hedges during building operations in accordance with saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

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

- all external hard surfaces within the site;**
- other surfacing materials;**
- means of enclosure**
- soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs;**

- **minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, signs, refuse or other storage units, etc.); and**
- **retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.**

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

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

Reason: To 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).

- 6. No development (excluding ground investigations or archaeological investigations) shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a wildlife management plan, to include as appropriate detailed proposals for the protection of bats, birds, reptiles, great crested newts and badgers, and measures for the mitigation of any harm to them likely to be caused by the development. The works and other measures forming part of that plan shall be carried out in accordance with it.**

Reason: To identify and ensure the survival and protection of important species and those protected by legislation that could be adversely affected by the development, having regard to Policy CS26 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- 7. No development (excluding ground investigations or archaeological investigations) shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).**

**The LEMP should provide suitable detail to provide confidence that measures for Biodiversity Net Gain will be successful and secure management for the foreseeable future. The LEMP should also specifically include measures to maintain and enhance the existing hedgerows alongside the creation of the new hedge proposed. Elsewhere, and if appropriate, measures to prevent erosion of the access point encroaching further into the Local Wildlife Site (LWS) should be adopted as well as measures to prevent informal car parking on the verge. In contrast, the measures to enhance/manage the grassland immediately to the north of the roadside hedge will support the LWS are welcomed but require expression in greater detail;**

Reason: To provide in detail how biodiversity net gain will be achieved on site and maintained, having regard to Policy CS26 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- 8. No development (excluding ground investigations or archaeological investigations) shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a Lighting Strategy which maintains dark corridors. This should compare levels of illumination prior to and post-construction and be accompanied by a statement from the ecologist explaining how it meets its goals.**

Reason: To maintain dark corridors within, and adjacent to the local wildlife site, having regard to Policy CS26 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

9. **Prior to the use of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access shall be provided and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan drawing number C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2001 (contained within the submitted transport statement (JNP Group)) in accordance with Hertfordshire's Design Guidance. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted arrangement shall be made for surface water to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge onto the highway carriageway.**

Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid the carriage of extraneous material or surface water onto the highway in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018), Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 54 of the Local Plan (2004)

10. **Prior to the first occupation / use of the development hereby permitted a visibility splay shall be provided in full accordance with the details indicated on the approved plan number C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2001 (contained within the submitted transport statement (JNP Group)). The splay shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction between 600mm and 2m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.**

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018), Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 54 of the Local Plan (2004)

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

- **details of the layout and siting of Electric Vehicle Charging Points and any associated infrastructure and secure cycle storage fully in accordance with Dacorum adopted Parking Standards (Nov 2020);**
- **the refuse facilities fully in accordance with Dacorum Borough Refuse Storage Guidance Note ( 2015);**

**The development shall not be occupied until these measures have been provided and these measures shall thereafter be retained fully 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).

12. **No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the LPA for approval. The scheme shall also include:**

1. **Detailed Falling Head Tests carried out at the exact location and depth of proposed infiltrating features (deepbore soakaways). Supported by ground investigation and a contamination report.**
2. **Groundwater monitoring over the autumn/winter for a period of ideally 6 months.**

3. If infiltration is not feasible, an alternative drainage strategy should be provided with all appropriate permissions.
4. Detailed drainage layout and 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 climate change event. Including half drain down times within 24 hours.
5. Demonstrate appropriate SuDS management and treatment and inclusion of above ground features such as permeable paving, swales etc. for the access road and driveways; reducing the requirement for any underground storage.
6. Silt traps for protection for any residual tanked elements.
7. Final detailed management plan including any arrangements for adoption to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime

The approved scheme shall be implemented in full for the life of the development.

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 Core Strategy (2013).

13. (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.
- (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:
- (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.
- (c) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (b), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- (d) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:
- (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.
  - (ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.

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

14. **Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 13 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.**

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

15. **No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include assessment of significance and research questions; and:**

1. **The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording**
2. **The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording as required by the evaluation**
3. **The programme for post investigation assessment**
4. **Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording**
5. **Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation**
6. **Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation**
7. **Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.**

Reason: To record and advance understanding of the significance of any underground heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible in accordance with paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2019) and Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013)

16. **i) Any demolition/development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition 15.**  
**ii) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.**

Reason: To record and advance understanding of the significance of any underground heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible in accordance with paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2019) and Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013)

**Informatives:**

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. 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. The site is located within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3; therefore, the applicant should contact the Environment Agency (EA) regarding any requirements they may have on the use of infiltration within a source protection zone.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.

## APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

| Consultee                                    | Comments   |
|--|--|
| Environmental And Community Protection (DBC) | <p>I have reviewed the details and information provided.<br/>I have no in principle objections to the application and do not recommend any environmental protection consent conditions.</p> <p>26/02/2021:</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 is for a proposed use that would be particularly vulnerable to the presence of contamination, and as such the possibility of ground contamination cannot be ruled out at this stage. Therefore, the following planning conditions should be included if permission is granted.</p> |

Contaminated Land Conditions:

Condition 1:

(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.

(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:

- (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.

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

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

(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.

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

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

Condition 2:

Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 1 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
|              | <p>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:<br/>The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) &amp; (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.</p> <p>The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on <a href="http://www.dacorum.gov.uk">www.dacorum.gov.uk</a> by searching for contaminated land and I would be grateful if this fact could be passed on to the developers.</p> |
| 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>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</p>    |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services</a></p> <p>Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.</p> <p>Water Comments<br/> 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>   |
| Hertfordshire Highways (HCC) | <p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.</p> <p>1) Prior to the use of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access shall be provided and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan drawing number C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2001 in accordance with Hertfordshires Design Guidance. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted arrangement shall be made for surface water to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge onto the highway carriageway.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid the carriage of extraneous material or surface water onto the highway 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 shall be provided in full accordance with the details indicated on the approved plan number C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2001. The splay shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction between 600mm and 2m above the level of the adjacent</p> |

highway carriageway.

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

#### Highway Informatives

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

AN 1) Construction standards for works within the highway: All works to be undertaken on the adjoining highway shall be constructed to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, by an approved contractor, and in accordance with Hertfordshire County Council's publication "Roads in Hertfordshire - Highway Design Guide". Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN 2) 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.

AN 3) 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.

AN 4) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

#### Comments

This proposal is an outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the development of 4 dwellings on land north of Pickford Road, Markyate. Pickford Road is 30 mph, classified C local access route which is maintained at public expense. The land is currently vacant fields adjacent existing housing.

#### Vehicle Access

I would start by saying that for an outline application, this is very detailed. The site currently has no suitable vehicle access. The proposal is stating that there will be a 6 metre wide private route leading to the 4 dwellings. This private route will access Pickford Road via a large junction. The applicant has clearly illustrated that the required visibility splay of 2.4 x 43 metres can be achieved in drawing

C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2001 which HCC is pleased with. The applicant has proven that large vehicles such as fire appliances and refuge vehicles can manoeuvre on site in order to exit and the enter the site in forward gear, this can be seen in drawings C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2001, C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2002 and C85856-JNP-66-XX-DR-C-2003. HCC is satisfied that these drawing are accurate and illustrate that the dwellings can be accessed via the appropriate services. The 4 dwellings are unlikely to create a large change in movements to the surrounding highway network and these would likely be within peak am and pm times, not constantly.

#### Drainage

The proposed new driveway would need to make adequate provision for drainage on site to ensure that surface water does not discharge onto the highway. Surface water from the new hardstanding would need be collected and disposed of on site.

#### Sustainability

It is noted that the site would mainly be accessed via a private car. Although, the site lies adjacent a footpath that leads to the nearby village of Markyate which is connected via bus to larger towns and has amenities such as food stores, a PH and a village school.

#### Refuse / Waste Collection

Provision would need to be made for an on-site bin-refuse store within 30m of each dwelling and within 25m of the kerbside/bin collection point. The collection method must be confirmed as acceptable by DBC waste management.

#### Emergency Vehicle Access

The proposed dwelling is within the recommended emergency vehicle access of 45 metres from the private route to all parts of the buildings. This is in accordance with the guidance in 'MfS', 'Roads in Hertfordshire; A Design Guide' and 'Building Regulations 2010: Fire Safety Approved Document B Vol 1 - Dwellinghouses'.

#### Conclusion

HCC has no objections or further comments on highway grounds to the

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
|                                  | <p>proposed development, subject to the inclusion of the above highway informatives and condition at this current outline stage.</p> <p>If the development is to change greatly at the full planning stage then HCC Highways would like to be informormed.</p>  |
| Trees & Woodlands                | <p>According to the AIA the development has minimal impact to the surrounding trees and protection measures are appropriate for all retained trees. Consequently I have no objections and recommend approval.</p>   |
| Conservation & Design (DBC)      | <p>This is a sensitive open site on the edge of town and the AONB. It is located on the opposite side of the road/Green to Little Cheverells, a listed building with associated, separately listed granary. As no designs for the houses have been provided at this stage, it is not possible to comment on their impact on the setting of the listed buildings, although it should be noted that Little Cheverells was built to face onto Friendless Lane and the Granary's significance has been compromised somewhat by conversion in recent years of the former farm buildings to the rear of the house.</p> <p>A full assessment would need to await submission of plans and elevations of the proposed 4 houses.</p>  |
| Parish/Town Council              | <p>Objection. More and more housing being proposed for the village of Markyate. We will have less and less green land as a consequence of all these building applications. The existing footpath would have to remain. Extending the boundary of the village. Last application allowed for affordable housing - this does not.</p>  |
| Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC) | <p>Thank you for consulting us on the above application for the Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for the development of 4 dwellings on land north of Pickford Road, Markyate at Land SW Of Frindles Cheverells Green, Markyate, Hertfordshire, AL3 8AB.</p> <p>As this is a minor application, we are not statutory consultee, however we are happy to provide advice to the LPA.</p> <p>We previously provided comments on application reference: 20/01538/OUT - Land North Of Pickford Road, Markyate, Hertfordshire at this site, which was for the Outline planning (all matters reserved) for 6 dwellings with new access point from Pickford Road. Our latest comments on application 20/01538/OUT were made in our letter dated 10 November 2020.</p> <p>The applicant has provided the following information in support of the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Flood Risk Assessment, Reference: C85856-R001B, dated</li> </ul> |

19.01.2021, Rev. D, prepared by JNP Group.

o Drainage Investigation, Project: C85856 - Pickford Road, Markyate, Ref. R002 RevC, Rev. C, dated 03 Dec 2020, prepared by JNP Group.

o Letter from JNP Group, Ref. C85856/JC/MV-008, dated 11th February 2021

o Pre-planning enquiry from Thames Water, Ref. DS6080619, dated 29 January 2021

We have reviewed the Drainage Strategy drawing, Drawing No. C85856 JNP 52 XX DR C 2004, Revision P3, dated 19/01/2021, prepared by JNP Group. The proposed drainage strategy is a piped system for the collection of roof drainage, there is also permeable paving with sub-base, a geocellular storage tank, with discharge via deepbore soakaway. There is also a landscaped area which is a 300mm depression which the applicant states is to be used for "emergency storage in the case of soakaway failure".

The applicant has stated how "Surface water runoff from the buildings is to be collected by rainwater pipes and conveyed by a pipe network before out-falling to Borehole Soakaway 1. Attenuation for these areas is provided in the form of a geo-cellular storage tank." Regarding the access road and car parking, the applicant has stated how: "Surface water runoff from the access road and car park areas is to be collected by the permeable paving and outfall to Deep Borehole Soakaways 2 and 3. Attenuation for these areas is provided within the permeable paving sub-base."

From a review of the drainage strategy, the proposed method of surface water discharge is via deepbore soakaway; the applicant has provided information on the infiltration testing, which has been undertaken on site in the Drainage Investigation report.

The applicant has undertaken shallow infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365. This was carried out in three trial pits. No observable infiltration occurred within these pits, confirming that shallow infiltration is not feasible for this site.

The applicant then undertook borehole infiltration testing. Unfortunately, we hold a number of concerns regarding the borehole infiltration testing results.

Borehole infiltration looks to be variable at the site, though no plan showing the trial pits and borehole locations has been provided. Regardless, variability can be seen within the boreholes themselves; in borehole 1 (BH1) infiltration appears to work at 10m depth, recording a rate of  $4.1 \times 10^{-5}$ . However, the same borehole (BH1) at 20m depth did not achieve a calculated soil infiltration rate after 165 minutes. This is an odd result; we would expect infiltration to have worked at a greater depth if it is indeed into the chalk. From a review of the borehole logs, for BH1 at 10m depth and 20m depth, the material is "Soft to firm white silty CLAY. LEWES NODULAR CHALK FORMATION AND SEAFORD CHALK FORMATION". The materials appear to be in conflict; with clay

a broadly impermeable material and chalk a broadly permeable material.

Similar oddities can be seen in borehole 2 (BH2), borehole 2 was tested at 20m depth, with a calculated soil infiltration rate of  $6.4 \times 10^{-6}$ . As LLFA we would regard this as a very low rate for what is stated to be into chalk. From a review of the borehole logs for BH2, this also shows "Soft to firm white silty CLAY. LEWES NODULAR CHALK FORMATION AND SEAFORD CHALK FORMATION" at 20m depth.

No detailed modelling has been provided to support the proposed strategy. Given the low rates of infiltration, we would be concerned if the half drain down times could be achieved within 24 hours.

The three currently proposed deep borehole soakaways may not be able to effectively drain the site. The applicant will likely need to provide multiple deepbore soakaways at the site in order for infiltration via deepbore to be feasible and appropriate. The applicant could also consider providing deeper soakaways, it is likely that additional deepbore soakaways are needed, more attenuation is needed, or a different strategy is needed.

Given the variability shown, if multiple and additional deepbore soakaways are proposed, we would recommend the need to test each soakaway before it can be determined as effective surface water discharge.

In terms of modelling the drainage system, the applicant should provide all modelling results, we need to ensure that there is no flooding on site up until and including the 1 in 30 year and no flooding of any building up until and including the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event, including no flooding off site. Modelling is needed to demonstrate the volumes can be managed on site.

Given the depth of deepbore soakaways proposed, and if deeper soakaways are proposed, we would recommend groundwater monitoring is undertaken over the autumn and winter months.

Given the information provided to date, it is likely that deepbore won't be an effective method of surface water discharge for the site. As advised previously, if feasible rates of infiltration are unable to be achieved, the applicant will have to find an alternative means of surface water discharge. It is acknowledged that there are no watercourses or surface water sewers within the vicinity of the site, there is a foul sewer running parallel to the south eastern boundary of the site. Discharge to foul sewer sits at the bottom of the surface water discharge hierarchy, we would therefore expect any surface water discharge to be minimised as much as possible. It would need to be at or below the greenfield runoff rate from the site, with the rate agreed with the operating Water and Sewerage Company for the area.

In the additional information provided by the applicant, a pre-planning

enquiry has been included from Thames Water. The applicant had requested: "Proposed foul and storm flows to discharge via gravity into foul water manhole ref. 5801. Surface water runoff restricted to 5.0l/s. Total site area: 0.45Ha". However, Thames Water stated how they would only agree: "Notwithstanding the above, we will accept a peak discharge rate of 1.8litres/second for all storm events up to and including 1in100year+40%CC for this site. Discharge rates can be readily restricted using suitably protected orifice plates or proprietary products such as vortex control devices.". Within the letter from JNP Group provided by the applicant in support of the application, this discharge rate is acknowledged at 1.8l/s and stated how additional attenuation would be required, to be provided in the open space if needed. No supporting calculations or alternative drainage layout plan have been provided. As in accordance with the surface water discharge hierarchy and Thames Water's pre-planning enquiry response, the applicant would need to demonstrate the discharge hierarchy has been followed. As such, additional infiltration testing for deepbore soakaway will need to be undertaken, before the final drainage strategy is confirmed.

It should be noted that with any attenuation system, half drain down times should be provided.

As this is a greenfield site, we are concerned at the use of underground tanks. We would expect above ground storage to be prioritised. The applicant is proposing an exceedance area, we would recommend that this area could be more formally managed as a SuDS attenuation basin, particularly considering the flood volume needing to be managed. However, we would highlight that deep borehole soakaways should not be placed at the base of attenuation basins. The applicant should therefore detail the frequency of use of this exceedance area to determine if the deep borehole soakaways could be compromised. The applicant has said how the storage within the exceedance area and below ground storage in the form of permeable paving and a cellular tank are needed. Currently we would recommend that the whole system is modelled, as from the current calculations it shows a lot of flooded volume. If this volume is provided for within the system, more details should be provided. However, given the above comments it is acknowledged that the system may change as a result.

As highlighted previously, the site is also within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3; therefore, the applicant should contact the Environment Agency (EA) regarding any requirements they may have on the use of infiltration within a source protection zone. The LPA may wish to consider consulting the EA on this application.

From a review of the national Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping, the site itself is at a very low risk of surface water flooding. Along the access road, there is a predicted low risk of surface water

flooding. The applicant has highlighted how there is a ditch which runs along this access road. They have also noted regarding the potential overtopping of this ditch onto the site. The applicant has shown the height of any potential overtopping, and this is within a landscaped buffer. The applicant is proposing a 300mm depression for excess surface water; though this does not appear to be part of the formalised drainage scheme for the site. Additional information should be provided regarding this.

#### Further comments

As the same drainage strategy has been proposed as that of 20/01538/OUT, we do still hold the same concerns regarding the unusual deepbore infiltration results. We would like to see the applicant clarify the above, including why borehole 1 (BH1) infiltration appears to work at 10m depth, recording a rate of  $4.1 \times 10^{-5}$ . However, at 20m depth did not achieve a calculated soil infiltration rate after 165 minutes. We would expect the rate to potentially be better at a deeper level. There are also some other odd deepbore infiltration results as detailed above. There are also some other aspects which need clarification, such as the modelling and calculations which are needed to show the site can accommodate the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event and achieve half drain down times within 24 hours. We would recommend that the above information is sought prior to approval.

However, considering that this is a minor application, if the LPA is minded to approve the application, we suggest the following pre-commencement condition should planning permission be granted.

#### 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 scheme shall also include:

1. Detailed Falling Head Tests carried out at the exact location and depth of proposed infiltrating features (deepbore soakaways). Supported by ground investigation and a contamination report.
2. Groundwater monitoring over the autumn/winter for a period of ideally 6 months.
3. If infiltration is not feasible, an alternative drainage strategy should be provided with all appropriate permissions.
4. Detailed drainage layout and 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 climate change event. Including half drain down times within

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>24 hours.</p> <p>5. Demonstrate appropriate SuDS management and treatment and inclusion of above ground features such as permeable paving, swales etc. for the access road and driveways; reducing the requirement for any underground storage.</p> <p>6. Silt traps for protection for any residual tanked elements.</p> <p>7. Final detailed management plan including any arrangements for adoption to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime</p> <p>The approved scheme shall be implemented in full for the life of the development.</p> <p>Reason<br/>To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of and disposal of surface water from the site</p> <p>Informative to the LPA<br/>We would be happy to offer further advice and comments with any additional information submitted by the applicant.<br/>We would recommend the LPA obtains a management and maintenance plan, to ensure the SuDS features can be maintained throughout the development's lifetime. This should follow the manufacturers' recommendation for maintenance and/or guidance in the SuDS Manual by Ciria.<br/>Please note if the LPA decides to grant planning permission, we wish to be notified for our records should there be any subsequent surface water flooding that we may be required to investigate as a result of the new development.</p> |
| <p>Campaign To Protect Rural England</p> | <p>I write with regard to the above application for residential development. CPRE Hertfordshire objects to this proposal for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. The site lies in the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt designated as an Area of Development Restraint in Part 3 Purpose of Development Strategy of the adopted Dacorum Borough Local Plan, as amended by the Core Strategy 2014 and Site Allocations DPD. It is located adjacent to the Green Belt and outside the built-up area of Markyate and immediately adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>2. The DBLP in Part 3 states that, in the Rural Area "development should be controlled... to prevent damage to the ... quality and purpose of the countryside" In accepting that the Rural Area has a different role to the Green Belt, development which may be permitted is related mainly to the encouragement of rural enterprise and landscape and other environmental protections.</p> <p>3. Further, the Dacorum Core Strategy 2014 Policies CS1 and CS7 provide for protection of the existing character of the settlement, in this case, Markyate, and the adjoining countryside. In our view, the proposed development marks a noticeable increase to the built-up area of the village of Markyate and will have a significant impact on the countryside in this sensitive location.</p> <p>4. The form of development, with four large dwellings, is inappropriately dense on the edge of the village and would adversely affect the amenity and existing character of the surrounding area which comprises mainly single houses in large gardens.</p> <p>5. The location of the proposed development sited beyond common land, and forming a Local Wildlife site fronting Pickford Road, also provides an incongruous extension of the village built-up area and is likely to affect the environmental character of the common land.</p> |
|--|---|

**APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES**

**Number of Neighbour Comments**

| <b>Neighbour Consultations</b> | <b>Contributors</b> | <b>Neutral</b> | <b>Objections</b> | <b>Support</b> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 5                              | 12                  | 0              | 12                | 0              |

**Neighbour Responses**

| <b>Address</b> | <b>Comments</b> |
|----------------|-----------------|
|                |                 |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>116 Pickford Road<br/>Markyate<br/>St Albans<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>AL3 8RL</p> | <p>I would like to object to the proposed application to build 4 houses on a near by field close to a public footpath for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The developer / owner is not being open with their intend for the remaining half of the field. Therefore, I assume the real application is for 8 houses not 4 which is not appropriate for the immediate surroundings and is a deliberate omission.</li> <li>2) The application doesn't include any designs of what the developer / owner plans to build, how do we know if the proposal will be suitable to the area.</li> <li>3) Access to the remaining half of the would be on top of the public footpath</li> <li>4) The area is currently full of wildlife and provides a corridor for the wildlife on both sides of Pickford Road.</li> <li>5) The density of 4/8 houses is out of keeping with the other houses on Cheverells Green</li> <li>6) The field itself is bounded on two sides by Area of outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) land and this sort of application would affect the environment adversely.</li> <li>7) Common land should not be a piece of fenced land inside a field as compensation for the loss of common land, how will the public use it?</li> <li>8) The real development of 8 houses would result in another 16 vehicles which would put to much strain on the junction with the High Street and Hicks Road</li> <li>9) There are still too many brown field sites in Dacorum Borough to warrant the use of green land</li> <li>10) The developer has clearly not walk up or down Pickford Road. Therefore, their statement on sustainability is completely unrealistic, specially with the limited bus service in the village meaning the use of cars is the only option.</li> </ol> <p>I therefore object to this planning application.</p> |
| <p>120 Pickford Road<br/>Markyate<br/>St Albans<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>AL3 8RL</p> | <p>I would like to object to the planning application, as this is completely unsuitable for the local area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the provision of 4 detached houses in a small estate outside the village boundary and fronting onto Cheverells Green is at odds with all the other houses on the Green.</li> <li>2) the area is currently a haven for wildlife and provides a key corridor for the passage of wildlife on both sides of Pickford Road.</li> <li>3) by only applying for a development of half of the field, it is clear that further development will be sought.</li> <li>4) the last application in July last year was withdrawn as it was entirely unsuitable. This application makes no material changes other than slightly reducing the housing density.</li> <li>5) the Local Plan has identified this site as being unsuitable for housing development and so has been excluded from the Plan.</li> </ol>  |
| <p>Markyate Village Hall<br/>Cavendish Road<br/>Markyate St Albans</p>            | <p>Objection. More and more housing being proposed for the village of Markyate. We will have less and less green land as a consequence of all these building applications. The existing footpath would have to</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Hertfordshire<br/>AL3 8PS</p>   | <p>remain. Extending the boundary of the village. Last application allowed for affordable housing - this does not.</p>   |
| <p>Little Cheverells<br/>Cheverells Green<br/>Markyate<br/>St Albans<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>AL3 8AA</p> | <p>We object to the above planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>We own and live in Little Cheverells, a grade II listed house diagonally across Pickford Road from the development site. We have reviewed the application and supplementary documents carefully and are also aware of the history of planning applications in respect of this site, my having grown up in Little Cheverells prior to our purchase in 2016.</p> <p>Our objections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The upper floor of Little Cheverells looks directly onto the site and is not screened by the adjacent cottage or trees as described. The development of 4 houses on the application site, and the development of the access road and footpath will cause visual harm to the listed property, a harm that has been protected for 200 years.</li> <li>o The 'scale' of the development, whilst currently 4 houses, is known not to be the final extent of the intended development of this site - as was acknowledged in writing by the marketing material about the site that was distributed to local homeowners and the council itself and mentions the capacity for 10-12 houses in relation to this owners prior, rejected, application.</li> <li>o The development site will unquestionably extend the boundary of the built village further up Pickford Road, and detrimentally develop for the first time open, rural land that is part of Cheverells Green. The development of this site has been consistently rejected and objected to over numerous applications in relation to this and other nearby sites over decades for good reason.</li> <li>o It is adjacent to an AONB and its development will affect the visual and natural amenity for the many users of the AONB and the adjacent public footpath running along two sides of the site. The footpath does not need upgrading or improving, and no one using it would say so.</li> <li>o The proposed new access road is not in keeping with other access roads, it would have an obvious and detrimental affect to the appearance of the Green.</li> <li>o The proposal for 4 houses is clearly not a significant address of local housing needs and the argument for development does not outweigh the negatives of beginning to allow development of this area of Markyate. There are other sites in Markyate which have been considered to have greater benefit and less detriment, such as MY-H1, and the development of brownfield sites in the village such as those on Hicks Road should be prioritised before green field developments are permitted.</li> <li>o The traffic generated by any development on this road cannot be</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>supported by the existing roads in Markyate which are already congested and lacking parking. It is unrealistic that walking and cycling will be the primary connection to the village high street, in view of the steep hill.</p> <p>Consequently we object to this application and hope that the Council protect this land as many of their predecessors have.</p>  |
| <p>Cheverells Cottage<br/> Cheverells Green<br/> Markyate<br/> St Albans<br/> Hertfordshire<br/> AL3 8AA</p> | <p>I am writing to object to the outline planning application to build 4 houses on greenfield land outside the boundary of the village of Markyate, off Pickford Rd. I live opposite the proposed development in Cheverells Cottage. The properties that stand opposite the proposed development, are all either Grade 2 listed or adjacent to Grade 2 listed buildings, and have been in this rural location for over 2 centuries. The site itself is bounded on two sides by Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and on a third side by Cheverells Green, a designated Wildlife Site and this application would affect the green environment tremendously.</p> <p>The following notes are my objections to the development :</p> <p>This is a rural greenfield site -the field itself is surrounded on 2 sides by designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, of which it looks very much a part. There is also a very much used public footpath running the entire length of the field.</p> <p>It is outside the village boundary, with no existing buildings or metalled access. As such the proposed development of 4 houses is inappropriate both in scale and type and in the impact that it would have on the area. The proposed metalled road access across the Green, Common Land and wildlife site, would add to the urbanising effect of the Green.</p> <p>Visual impact - The Planning Statement and the Heritage Statement, both emphasise the screening of the houses from view of Pickford Road and listed properties opposite by the existing hedgerow, and promises of hedge planting; but currently in the winter months the whole site is very visible from Pickford Rd as the field hedging is deciduous, apparently, this has not been accounted for! At present we can actually look out from our living room and see right across to the farmers fields. Four houses in a rural field are not appropriate for a rural area surrounded by AONB.</p> |

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
|                                 | <p>Access road - The proposed two-way access road would have significant impact on Cheverells Green which is open Common land and a semi-wilded part of the landscape that stretches between the hedgerow and the road. Cheverells Green is designated a Wildlife Site. The proposed access road and the row of houses would have an urbanising impact.</p> <p>Light and noise pollution - The area is rural and there are no street lights, so there would be increased light pollution after dark which is detrimental to wildlife. Although the ecological report states that there is no notable wildlife, as a local resident I am aware of owls, foxes, muntjac, Red Kites, Buzzards, Woodpeckers indeed I spotted some Siskin on this land earlier in the year, along with many other species of birds.</p> <p>Sustainability and Transport - The developers say this development is sustainable and the impact of cars and parking is denied; but the idea that people will not get their cars out to go down the steep hill to the village (a 15-20-minute walk) is unrealistic. Few people in Markyate can live in the village without a car, as the bus services are negligible. Markyate's location is only sustainable if you have a car. The village centre is already parked up to the hilt and lies in at the bottom of a steep hill, while the proposed houses stand at the top of the hill, with no bus stop, and cycling needs stamina or an electric boost. The current traffic between 7.00am-9.00am and 15.00pm-18.00pm is already extremely busy and the junction at the bottom of Pickford Rd is an absolute `accident waiting to happen`, the increase in traffic if this development is given approval will only enhance the chances of this occurring, both during the construction phase and afterwards.</p> <p>I believe that there have been three previous planning applications on this land in 1992, 1996, and 2020 by the same owner, Mr J Armstrong; all were either turned down or withdrawn for reasons of the protection of greenfield land outside the village boundary. What has changed for this development to now be considered ?</p> <p>The water-pressure at present is greatly affected during peak hours, Affinity Water have been notified several times and they do not seem to be able to increase it at all, surely any further dwellings can only be detrimental to the pressure of the water and therefore having an impact on already established properties.</p> <p>Once this land is developed, then I truly believe that this will then give other land-owners in the area belief that they will then be able to develop their own land and sadly this could well be the end of the hamlet that is Cheverells Green.</p> <p>Given all of the above I therefore reject to planning approval being given for the above development.</p> |
| The Granary<br>Cheverells Green | Ref: Outline Planning Application 21/ 00441/OUT  |

Markyate  
St Albans  
Hertfordshire  
AL3 8AA

I am writing to object to the outline planning application to build 4 houses on greenfield land outside the boundary of the village of Markyate, off Pickford Rd. I live opposite the proposed development in a Grade 2 listed property, 'The Granary'. The three properties that stand opposite the proposed development, are all either Grade 2 listed or adjacent to Grade 2 listed buildings, and have been in this rural location for over 200 years. The site itself is bounded on two sides by Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) land and on a third side by Cheverells Green, a designated Wildlife Site and this application would affect the green environment adversely. Cheverells Green was envisaged as a 'Green Entrance' to the Village of Markyate, more development will degrade this vision.

My objections are as follows:

This is a rural greenfield site - it accommodates a much-used rural footpath on one side and is surrounded on 2 sides by designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, of which it looks very much a part. It is a strange anomaly that it is not actually part of the designated land. It is outside the village boundary, with no existing buildings or metalled access. As such the proposed development of 4 houses is inappropriate both in scale and type in the impact that it would have on the area. The proposed metalled road access across the Green, Common Land and wildlife site, would add to the urbanising effect on the Green.

Visual impact - The Planning Statement and the Heritage Statement, both emphasise the screening of the houses from view of Pickford Road and listed properties opposite by the existing hedgerow, and promises of hedge planting. However, in the winter months the whole site is very visible from Pickford Rd as the field hedging is deciduous, apparently, this has not been accounted for! Four houses in a rural field are not appropriate for a rural area surrounded by AONB.

Access road - The proposed two-way access road would have significant impact on Cheverells Green which is open Common land and a semi-wilded part of the landscape that stretches between the hedgerow and the road. Cheverells Green is designated a Wildlife Site. The proposed access road would have an urbanising impact.

Light and noise pollution - The area is rural and there are no street lights, so there would be increased light pollution after dark which is detrimental to wildlife. Although the ecological report states that there is no notable wildlife, as a local resident I am aware of owls, foxes, muntjac, and small mammals in the area, as well as many other species of birds.

Sustainability and Transport - The developers say this development is sustainable and the impact of cars and parking is denied; but the idea that people will not get their cars out to go down the steep hill to the village (a 15-20-minute walk) is unrealistic. Few people in Markyate can live in the village without a car, as the bus services are negligible. Markyate's location is only sustainable if you have a car. The village centre is already parked up to the hilt and lies at the bottom of a steep hill, while the proposed houses stand at the top of the hill, with no bus

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>stop, and cycling needs stamina or an electric boost.</p> <p>Previous applications - There have been three previous planning applications on this land in 1992, 1996, and 2020 by the same owner, Mr J Armstrong; all were either turned down or withdrawn for reasons of the protection of greenfield land outside the village boundary.</p> <p>General Dacorum Borough Council's (DBC) planning approach - In the Draft Report of responses to Dacorum Borough Council's New Local Plan Consultation, Officer comments include the following: "The Urban Capacity Study will review the potential for new development to be accommodated in existing settlements, and look to minimise greenfield development in accordance with the NPPF." DBC has emphasised that they would look to develop in brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites. There are other available brownfield sites in Markyate, however, following a couple of large developments of new housing completed over the past 16 years, it is debateable that the village can accommodate any more houses (and cars), when parking is at breaking point and the one and only village car-park is full.</p> <p>The Draft New Local Plan Consultation - in DBC's New Local Plan which has just been consulted on, there is an excessive number of houses planned for development over the next 18 years, and the land where they currently intend to build these houses has been identified. That is an excessive number compared to the Office for National Statistics' figures of need in the Borough. So, there is no need for more houses to be built on green field land which is not in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Replacement Common Land - the developers are offering a piece of fenced-off common land inside the field to compensate for the loss of Common land taken out of Cheverells Green. They say that it will be accessible. Really?! This is purely an empty offer, as it is totally impracticable to go around the corner to walk around a small piece of fenced 'garden' as part of public access to common land, while a large piece of the existing Common land is removed from a wildlife site.</p> <p>Domino effect - once this land is developed, then there is a short step to other land owners of green fields along Cheverells Green applying to do the same.</p> <p>I therefore object to this planning application.</p> |
| <p>Frindles<br/>Cheverells Green<br/>Markyate<br/>St Albans<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>AL3 8AB</p> | <p>Dear Mr Le -Cart,</p> <p>Ref the above planning application to build four houses on greenfield land adjacent to my property. I have lived here with my family since 1989. During this time several applications for development on this site have been submitted and either withdrawn or rejected by the planning authority.</p> <p>The proposed site is outside Markyate Village boundary and adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty on two sides . To the front of the site is Cheverells Green , which is both common land and a wildlife site and which the planned two way access road would ruin . The</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>suggested area of fenced garden inside the field to compensate is off track and serves no purpose .</p> <p>I understood that existing brown sites in Markyate should be considered for development in preference to greenfield sites . If this plan should be allowed , what would stop further development behind the proposed four houses ?</p> <p>I strongly object to this plan .</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Lesley Smith .</p>  |
| <p>110 Pickford Road<br/>Markyate<br/>St Albans<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>AL3 8RH</p>          | <p>I wish to once again to strongly object to the proposed application to build 4 houses on a beautiful field and public footpath in the village where I live. The plot is in stunning peaceful open countryside, regularly used to walk dogs and enjoyed by many. Pickford Road is a popular route out of the village and direct link to Beechwood Park school , Hemel Hempstead and beyond. Traffic speeds past the proposed site on a road that narrows in many places and is very dangerous. I believe the site would cause horrendous safety issues on this road. I live quite close to the proposed site and experience loss of water pressure on a regular basis because we are on the very edge of the village. I believe this problem would worsen if more houses were built. Markyate cannot provide amenities to support a swelling village and I think the doctors, school and other services will stretched to busting point<br/>APPLICATIONS HAVE BEEN DENIED IN THE PAST SO PLEASE STOP THIS ONE.</p>   |
| <p>High Oaks<br/>Cheverells Green<br/>Markyate St Albans<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>AL3 8RN</p> | <p>Firstly, we note that Dacorum has failed to notify us of this planning application, despite our house and drive being diagonally opposite the proposed new access road, which must infringe the notification requirements (as also occurred on the prior application) and have separately raised this with our local councillor.</p> <p>We set out here objections relating to proposed development Ref 20/01538/OUT, particularly on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Design, appearance &amp; materials</li> <li>- Visual intrusion</li> <li>- Noise and disturbance of use</li> </ul> <p>This application is a very close modification of a prior application, in essence for four rather than six dwellings but with respect to our objections, not altered.</p> <p>Design, Appearance and Materials<br/>Despite the numerous documents provided, none show appearance or materials but provide broad assertions on quality.<br/>Given the surrounding fields and properties several Grade II listed, we have considerable concerns around design, appearance and materials, which can only detract from the Cheverells Green area.</p> <p>Visual Intrusion<br/>Again, without adequate plans show elevations or commitment (as</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>opposed to general description) to retain the hedging and trees, visual impact cannot be assessed. Sadly, we were massively disappointed at the last significant development in Markyate on Hicks Road where the developer went bankrupt before adding key elements so we are inevitably sceptical around developers' general statement of benefits and impact. We doubt the practical utility of a new pond proposed with constrained public access.</p> <p>The land is not technically part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that surround it, only because it was part of the substantial property to the right of the field (the old and attractive doctor's surgery) on designation of AONB status. Cheverells Green does have protected wildlife status and this will clearly negatively impact that. The public footpath running alongside the proposed development is widely used by the village and this will have a negative visual impact, eroding the current ambiance around the AONB.</p> <p>Recognising that at present the proposal is for four houses it is reasonable to assume that the developer intends to subsequently add further houses on the significant amount of land not part of this proposal. This would lead to additional negative visual impact relative to the surrounding area.</p> <p><b>Noise and Disturbance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed access is via a new road which is diagonally opposite our drive. Inevitably, without close proximity to public transport, multiple vehicles will be adding to the already overloaded traffic, especially during peak school run time (noting Beachwood school location further down the road) and inevitably adding to the terrible bottlenecks in Markyate village. It will directly affect our entrance and exit to our property which is already difficult during peak times.</li> <li>- The proposal is for four houses and if approval is given, we expect the developer will then seeking further as there is an obvious tract of land behind this, adding to the traffic onto a road where few seem to take account of the speed limit.</li> <li>- We note the report on sewage and water but this does not accord with our or our neighbours experience of very low water pressure, at time inadequate to drive our shower and periodic need to rod down the Pickford Road hill by Thames Water, notably due to egress of tree roots.</li> </ul> <p>The field is outside the longstanding village boundary.</p> <p>In summary we therefore submit that this development should not be approved.</p> |
| <p>Adam Cottage<br/>Cheverells Green<br/>Markyate St Albans<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>AL3 8AD</p> | <p>I object to the above planning application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed development is on a virgin greenfield site.</li> <li>2. The site is outside the Markyate village boundary and built area.</li> <li>3. The site is bordered on two sides by an area of outstanding natural beauty, and by two well used public footpaths.</li> </ol>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>4. Furthermore the site is fronted by common land which is part of Cheverells Green, which is an ecological site, and used as an amenity for walkers, dog walkers and horse riders.</p> <p>5. The proposed development would join the built village of Markyate to the rural hamlet of Cheverells Green.</p> <p>6. The proposed development includes provision for a two way access over the common land, which means it is a road and both excessive and totally out of keeping with all other driveways and access to the other properties on Cheverells Green. This accessway is situated at the opening onto the public footpath, and would be a risk to users thereof.</p> <p>7. As there is no on street parking, and with the proposed development only having limited parking, it is inevitable that overspill and visitor parking will occur on the common land. This will be an eyesore, environmentally damaging, and a potential hazard for pedestrians.</p> <p>8. The ecological report states that there is 'no notable wildlife' on the site. This misses the point of the existing site being a conduit for wildlife to travel from the adjoining AONB onto the common land and onwards to the farmland and woodland bordering Friendless Lane across to Flamstead.</p> <p>9. I am informed that the site was excluded from the Dacorum Local Plan as not suitable for development.</p> <p>10. At least three previous planning applications for the site have been rejected, the most recent last year.</p> <p>11. The proposed development only occupies the front of the site, and could lead to subsequent follow on planning applications down the line if this application was approved.</p> <p>12. The development would add to further traffic congestion in the centre of the village, particularly at the gridlocked bottom of the hill where Pickford Road joins the High Street. The village is at bursting point with both local traffic, access to Beechwood Park School, and increasing through traffic using the lanes to cut through to Hemel and the M25. The village has local shops but nowhere to park to utilise them.</p> <p>13. There is no adequate public transport alternatives to car use.</p> <p>14. If there is still a need for more housing, then there are still unutilised brownfield sites within Markyate that should be prioritised.</p> |
| <p>2 Cheverells House<br/>Cheverells Green<br/>Markyate St Albans<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>AL3 8BH</p> | <p>I object strongly to the plans . The surrounding green space environment of Cheverells green should be protected for environmental and historical reasons . This development is out of keeping with the look of the area . It will also increase light and noise pollution in a peaceful area where the eco system allows barn owls , tawny owls and bats to flourish . Once green space is gone , it's gone forever , we need to protect Cheverells green for future generations . I am concerned our area of outstanding beauty will become a brown brick monstrosity which will effect the local vista.</p>  |
| <p>Old Sebight School<br/>Cheverells Green<br/>Markyate<br/>St Albans<br/>Herts<br/>AL3 8AB</p>     | <p>I respectfully express an objection to this planning application because the proposed development for housing would be detrimental at this rural location. I understand from another neighbour who lives opposite the site that no consultation notice has been displayed. Furthermore, Markyate Parish Council is meeting to consider the application tonight. Accordingly, I ask that you consider the matters below even though the usual period of 21 days has apparently passed since Dacorum</p>  |

Borough Council received the application.

There are very many reasons for objection, but the main points are as follows.

1. This application supersedes an earlier application 20/01538/OUT in relation to which Markyate Parish Council resolved to OBJECT at its meeting on 7 July 2020. That application was subsequently withdrawn.

a. The present application is very similar to the earlier application. The main difference is that now the proposal is for 4 detached houses (of a mix of 3 and 4-bed sizes) instead of 2 terraces containing 6 houses (3 and 4-beds).

b. The buildings in the current proposal would span most of the width of the field, as was the case with the earlier proposal.

2. The adverse impacts outweigh the benefits of the proposed development, for the various cumulative reasons below.

3. The field is bounded on two sides by the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ("AONB") and on a third side by the open common land on Cheverells Green

4. In practical terms, the field is accordingly part of the valuable surrounding rural and open landscape, even though it is - anomalously - not formally within the adjoining AONB or nearby Green Belt.

5. The field is outside the long-standing village boundary. This development would therefore extend the village into the valuable landscape.

6. The landscape has further value and significance for a number of reasons:

a. There is a public footpath running along two sides of the field and into the AONB, which is much-used.

b. Cheverells Green is a local feature with historical and ecological significance.

c. Many people enjoy the amenity benefits of the footpath and the Green, including residents, walkers and cyclists.

7. Any building on that landscape will be detrimental to it and the surrounding areas.

8. The proposal fails to give any real weight to the fact that the entire field has deliberately been omitted from the proposals for housing development in Dacorum BC's emerging new Local Plan to 2036.

a. The Local Plan is now at an advanced stage of preparation and therefore should be given weight accordingly.

b. The field was put forward in the call for sites as "My-h2" and its merits considered in detail in the preparation of the Local Plan.

c. Dacorum BC commissioned an appraisal by TRL of the field and other sites identified in the Local Plan process. TRL's appraisal dated October 2017 identified a preponderance of likely negative effects if the field were developed (ie on seven of the 15 factors assessed, with likely positive effects for only four factors).

d. In the wide-ranging initial public consultation, the Parish Council expressed concerns summarised as follows (see pp449 and 755 of Dacorum BC's report dated September 2019):

"My-h2 is located on a hill on the outskirts of the village makes it impractical without a car. - other issues raised including traffic problems, lack of social infrastructure (Doctors), the provision of sustainable transport and the protection of Green Belt and Chilterns

AONB."

e. The Parish Council's concerns overlapped with those expressed by the Chilterns Society (see pp449 and 755 of the report):

"My-h2 is not acceptable for growth impact on wildlife and AONB, site would not encourage walking or cycling due to topography of the site."

f. The Chilterns Conservation Board similarly objected "due to the negative impacts it would have on Chiltern AONB, wildlife, chalk streams, public walkways etc." (see pp458 and 755 of the report).

9. Any development on the field should be viewed in the context of a strategic plan for Cheverells Green as a whole. There is long-standing and existing pressure to develop open sites around the Green, including recently the land at the junction between Pickford Road and Friendless Lane ref 4/03300/16/MFA. Development on the field is likely to increase that pressure.

10. The proposed access road to the development across the Green is for two-way traffic and would have a direct, obvious and detrimental impact on the landscape and appearance of the Green.

11. The location of the field, away from the centre of the village, combined with the steep gradient of Pickford Road, is likely to discourage walking and cycling and increase motor traffic to and from the village, with resulting noise and emissions and worsening the serious problem of traffic congestion in the village especially at the difficult junction between the High Street/London Road, Pickford Road and Hicks Road.

12. There has already been a very considerable amount of development in Markyate in recent years to meet local housing needs, especially at the Hicks Road and Manor Farm sites.

13. There is already inadequate parking in the centre of the village to accommodate existing residents and visitors, especially following the development at Hicks Road. This is likely to be aggravated by new motor traffic from the proposed development.

14. There are presently vacant commercial units at the Hicks Road development which have been identified for potential housing use.

15. If and so far as there may be any unmet housing need in Markyate, there are likely to be other sites where the benefit of development would be greater and the detriment reduced. One of these is the larger site identified as "My-h1" in the current Local Plan process.

16. The proposal for the provision of 4 houses on the site will contribute very little towards meeting local housing needs, in contrast with the extent of the adverse impacts.

17. No affordable housing is proposed.

18. The present application covers only the front half of the field, leaving access and the possibility of further development of the rear half of the field in due course, accentuating the detrimental impacts.

In conclusion, therefore, the combination of these points provides strong reasons why the planning application should be refused.