ITEM NUMBER: 5a

21/00737/FUL	**Change of use to house of multiple occupancy .**	
Site Address:	**40 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN**	
Applicant/Agent:	**Mr Patel**	**Mr Abaan Suqlain**
Case Officer:	**Nigel Gibbs**	
Parish/Ward:	**Hemel Hempstead (No Parish)**	**Chaulden And Warners End**
Referral to Committee:	**Called in by Councillor Graeme Elliot due to overdevelopment and lack of car parking**	

RECOMMENDATION

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED.**

2. SUMMARY

2.1 No. 40 Valleyside is located within an established residential area of Hemel Hempstead wherein new residential development is considered to be acceptable in accordance with the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework supporting new housing development.

2.2 The proposed layout and design are based upon the adaptation of the approved extended dwellinghouse, enabling the provision of alternative housing within this longstanding residential area.

2.3 With due regard to Hertfordshire County Council Highways advice, the use is considered to be compatible with the existing local highway and parking conditions.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 No. 40 is an end of terrace extended 3 storey dwellinghouse located at the south eastern end of Valleyside which faces onto Shrubhill Common, with the dwellings served by a rear access road. A block of flats adjoins no. 40, separated by a footpath which links the roadway with the fronts of the dwellings.

3.2 The dwelling has been converted into building for multiple occupation. Its garage has been demolished to provide a parking and refuse storage area. The rear and front gardens are allocated communal amenity areas.

3.3 The unit provides communal kitchen, utility room and 7 habitable en-suite rooms that range from 14 sqm to 20sqm. Each unit is fully furnished with furniture and white goods.

3.4 The site is located within Character Area HCA 3 (Warners End), Parking Zone 3, CIL Zone 2 and Air Limits Areas.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 This is a retrospective application for the change use of no. 40 to a building in multiple occupation. It has been confirmed by the Agent that the units are ‘offered at competitive rates with all bills inclusive giving a cost-effective edge’ and no. 40 is managed by a very experienced HMO property management team. The application is for a large HMO which is regarded as a ‘sui generis’ use through the Use Classes Order, involving more than 6 people sharing the accommodation.

4.2 On behalf of the HMO Property Management Team additional supporting information has been submitted which sets out the criteria for selecting sites and provides detailed operational information. Key elements of the scheme includes:

- The Location, which is very strategic to mainstream budget tenants.
- Room sizes are almost double the standard (6sqm to a max of 10sqm) and residents find this more appealing particularly given the Covid-19 pandemic. Demand exists because of the space provided and communal facilities. Normal 7 room HMOs are within 110 sqm properties. The £260,000 extensions have resulted in 140sqm of living space, allowing ample space for large rooms and excessive communal space.
- The reason to increase the number of occupants is to attract couples who are on a budget.
- Parking is not a concern as a high majority of existing tenants walk, cycle or use public transport to work.
- The majority of residents are on low budgets, away from their main homes or do not have any other option. The majority of the residents cannot afford to maintain vehicles.
- Accommodation is offered to disabled, homeless and council tenants.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications
4/01890/19/FHA - Two storey rear extension
GRA - 4th November 2019

4/01425/19/FHA - Ground floor rear extension with first floor rear extension, full width of the property. Additional windows to end of terrace elevation on both ground floor & first Floor.
REF - 26th July 2019

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL3
Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)
Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)
Residential Character Area: HCA3
Smoke Control Order
Parking Standards: New Zone 3
Town: Hemel Hempstead

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. POLICIES

National

National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)

National Planning Policy Guidance

National Design Guide

Dacorum Core Strategy 2013

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS2- Selection of Development Sites

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS8 - Sustainable Transport

CS9 - Management of Roads

CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS13 - Quality of Public Realm

CS17- New Housing

CS18- Mix of Housing

CS19- Affordable Housing

CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

CS32 - Air, Water and Soil Quality

Hemel Place Strategy

Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 2004

Policy 10 –Optimising the Use of Urban Land

Policy 13- Conditions

Policy 18- Size of New Dwellings

Policy 19- Conversions

Policy 21 – Density of Development

Policy 51- Development and Transport Impacts

Policy 54- Highway Design

Policy 58- Private Parking Provision

Policy 62- Cyclists

Policy 113- Exterior Lighting

Appendices 3 and 8

Site Allocations 2017

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents/ Advice Notes

Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (Nov 2020)

Environmental Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document

Refuse Storage Advice Note (2015)

Area Based Policies Supplementary Planning Guidance including HCA 22:Adeyfield South p177 to 181

Energy Efficiency and Conservation Supplementary Planning Document

Sustainable Development Advice Note

Water Conservation Supplementary Planning Document

Planning requirements for waste water Advice Note

Hertfordshire County Council Local Transport Plan 4

9. CONSIDERATIONS

9.1 Key Issues

These are:

1. Policy and Principle Residential Use /Housing.
2. Layout and the impact upon the residential amenity of the area.
3. The highway/ parking implications.

9.2 Policy and Principle: Residential Use /Housing

9.2.1 The site is located within the urban area of Hemel Hempstead. Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Dacorum Core Strategy wherein residential development is acceptable in principle. CS1 confirms Hemel Hempstead is to support new homes, as expressed through Hemel Place Strategy. CS4 clarifies that in residential areas appropriate residential development is acceptable

9.2.2 CS1 explains that Hemel Hempstead will be the focus of new homes and other development with an emphasis upon a range of factors. These include (d) maintaining the existing neighbourhood pattern. Any new development is required to comply with 3 criteria including being based upon the neighbourhood concept.

9.2.3 Policy CS2 also supports the development of previously developed land and building, as defined by the NPPF.

9.2.4 Policy CS17 supports new residential development to meet the Borough's housing needs with saved Policy 10 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (DBLP) expecting the optimisation of urban land. This is set against the Framework's emphasis upon delivering sustainable development, with the social objective of providing a sufficient number and range of new homes, as expressed through the NPPF's Part 5. Policy CS18 addresses the requirement to support a choice of homes through the provision of a range of housing types, sizes and tenure. This echoes the Framework's Paragraph 61 with Policy CS19 addressing affordable housing.

9.2.5 Saved DBLP Policy 19 relates to the conversion of buildings to residential which includes a range of criteria specifying standards regarding layout.

9.2.6 Layout is also addressed by the Framework's Parts 12 and 8 relating to high quality design/promoting healthy and safe communities. The NPPF and the National Design Guide are

complemented by Policies CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13, saved DBLP Appendix 3 which establishes the parameters for new development and the Area Based Policies Supplementary Planning Document, with Area HCA22 being directly relevant.

9.2.7 These housing based policies are set against the Framework's approach to 'making effective use of land' under Part 11 with specific regard to achieving appropriate densities under paragraphs 124 and 125. Paragraph 125 notes where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. This provides a context for saved DBLP Policy 21 regarding Density of Residential Development.

9.2.8 HCA22's approach to new development is for minimal change. Page 93 addresses the conversion to smaller units. This is to be discouraged, but proposals may be permitted where they do not harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. In particular, larger detached dwellings from the 1950's and 1960's era' may be appropriate.

9.2.9 This policy predates the Framework regarding delivering housing and has to be considered against the Council not having a demonstrable 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Under the Framework's paragraph 11 planning permission should therefore be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or if specific policies within the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide clear reasons for refusal.

9.2.10. In this case, the Council's previous support for no. 40's significant enlargement enables scope for its conversion / subdivision in diversifying its housing supply, as an up to date position in delivering new housing. It represents an opportunity to provide alternative accommodation to the long established family housing and provides a transition in housing type to the adjoining flats. In the circumstances it is not considered that HCA22's approach to discouraging smaller units should be given overriding weight. In this context there is a case for the principle of the subdivision.

9.3 Design/ /Impact upon the Character of the Area/Streetscape /Layout and the impact upon the residential amenity of the area.

Policy Context

9.3.1 This is with reference to Policies CS11, C12 and CS13, saved DBLP Appendix 3 and HCA22, saved DBLP Policy 19 the Framework's Part 12 and the National Design Guide.

9.3.2 Policies CS11, CS12 and CS13 are generally consistent with the relevant aims of the Framework. These expect that development within settlements should respect the typical density in the area, integrate with the streetscape character and contribute to the quality of the public realm, reinforced by the Framework's Part 12 and National Design Guide. The Framework's Paragraph 130 explains that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

9.3.3 The National Design Guide notes under H1 the importance of a 'Healthy, comfortable and safe internal and external environment' with reference to its Paragraphs 124 to 128. Paragraph 124 explains good design promotes quality of life for the occupants and users of buildings.

9.3.4 This is set against the aforementioned NPPF's approach to 'making effective use of land' under Part 11 with specific regard to achieving appropriate densities under paras 124 and 125.

Layout Issues

9.3.5 There is no specific Local Plan policy for HMOs. Based upon the existing site conditions and the submitted information, it is considered that the external and internal layout represent an appropriate approach to the building's conversion. This takes into account that there are no objections from the Environmental and Community Protection Unit and HCC Highways, with the

HMO subject to Building Regulations, Fire and Gas technical approvals. This is set against the provision of communal front and rear gardens, boundary fencing, refuse storage, cycle storage and 2 car parking spaces. The rear amenity area can be used for clothes drying.

The Impact upon the Residential Amenity of the Area

9.3.6 This is with due regard to the site conditions, the expectations of Policy CS12 and saved DBLP Appendix 3. It is with reference to the physical impact, privacy, the receipt of daylight and sunlight and in respect of noise and disturbance, the local representations to the application and the Council's Environmental and Community Team's response.

9.3.7 It is fully acknowledged that there would be an intensification of the building's use, including the garden area and parking implications.

9.3.8 With significant weight given to the Council's Environmental and Community Team's advice in conjunction with that of Hertfordshire County Council Highways, it is not considered that there would be harm to the residential amenity of the locality. This includes consideration of the relationship with no. 38 and the associated boundary fencing.

9.4 Highway Safety / Access/ Parking Issues

9.4.1 Hertfordshire County Council Highway Authority raises no objections, following its initial response. It is acknowledged that the parking spaces feature limited visibility.

9.4.2 It has been confirmed by the submitted supporting information that access of residents to car ownership is limited. The site is relatively close to the Local Stoneycroft Centre, with the Town Centre and railway station also accessible by bus, walking and cycle. The site is therefore a reasonably sustainable location. There is cycle storage which could be extended by providing a small communal secure outbuilding in the garden.

9.4.3 It should be taken into account that the 2019 extension enables the provision of a large family dwelling which could have significant car parking demands

9.4.4 The adopted Parking Standards paras 6.12 and 6.13 note:

'Dwelling Houses with Multiple Occupation (HMO):

- A property is an HMO if it is let as a main or only home to at least three tenants, who form more than one household and who share a kitchen, bathroom or toilet.

- When assessing planning applications, the Council will seek to ensure that the proposals provide adequate levels of car parking to meet the future standards of the likely occupants. Where possible, the car parking should be provided off street.

9.4.5 In this Zone 3 location there is a requirement for 0.5 spaces per bedroom i.e. 3.5 spaces for this 7 bedroom unit. Therefore, there is a shortfall of 1.5 spaces. With due regard to the submitted supporting information, HCC Highways advice and the overall benefits of providing alternative accommodation with the provision of an additional room, it is considered that there is a case to support the proposal. This is with due regard to the local representations regarding the parking implications.

9.4.6 A fire tender can park close to the site and the ground floor can be adapted for access for persons with disabilities and limited mobility, there is cycle and refuse storage.

9.5 Other Matters

9.5.1 There are no apparent crime prevention / security issues. There have been no responses to the drainage/ water supply implications from Thames Water and Affinity Water, set against Regulations approval. Although opposite the ecologically important Shrubhill Common, there are no apparent ecological implications. An Environmental Impact Assessment is not necessary.

9.5.2 The relevant concerns and objections raised by neighbours have been addressed above.

10. CONCLUSIONS

10.1 The proposal is in accordance with the Framework's social objectives in providing additional housing with associated economic benefits, with a limited expectation of a high level of reliance upon cars and with no objections from Hertfordshire County Highways.

10.2 These objectives are summarised by the supporting statement:

'Our properties purchased and converted to HMOs are carefully selected based on their central locations. Daily shopping is done within 10 min walk. Majority if not all our residents are employed within the town Centre, local nursing homes and industrial estate. Our room concepts appeal to those that have a higher budget than a simple room but not quite enough for a self-contained property. They are most suitable for couples that are saving monies. These tenants can rarely risk affording a car and rely on public transport, cycling and walking. Our tenants are thoroughly vetted, educated, and reminded of their responsibilities through inventories, inductions, inspections, and maintenance interactions. Each of residences have a notice board for ease of communication between house mates. Our live synopsis proves that only 25% HMO tenancies own vehicles. Based on these ratios 2 spaces are required. Currently we have 2 live tenancies and 3 tenants undergoing referencing. Among the 5 tenancies only one tenant owns a vehicle and two own a bicycle. It is the same ratio among our other residences of convenient locations. We are proud to confirm that more than 10% of our residents are sourced by the local housing, homeless prevention, and private sector officers. We follow regulations to core to meet the requirements of all local authorities to grow their trust in our residences'.

10.3 With due regard to the position regarding the parking implications and the quality of the housing accommodation, there are no overriding environmental objections. This is in the context of the local representations to the contrary. It is concluded that the converted no. 40 would deliver a sustainable development in accordance with the Framework's economic, social and environmental objectives.

10.4 With due regard to the lack of a 5 year housing supply, it is concluded that there are significant housing benefits in providing this additional type of housing in accordance with the Framework's paragraph 62. With reference to the tilted balance and National Planning Policy's Paragraph 11 (d), this social benefit outweighs the implications of the parking shortfall of 1.5 spaces.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be otherwise carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:**

Site Location Plan

VSHH 504 -P01
VSHH 505-P01
VSHH 506 -P01.

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

2. The use hereby permitted shall cease within 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:

(i) Within three months of the date of this decision full details of the provision of two parking spaces, cycle storage, refuse storage and a rear communal area, shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include a timetable for their implementation in full.

(ii) If within 11 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the details in (i) or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.

(iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted details shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.

(iv) The approved details shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

Upon implementation of the approved details, the parking spaces, cycle storage, refuse storage and rear communal area shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that adequate facilities are provided to residents/occupiers of the approved development in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and Saved Policy 19 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	**Comments**
Planning Enforcement	Response awaited.
Valuation & Estates Unit (DBC)	Response awaited.
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	Pollution Thank you for your consultation on the above planning application. I have reviewed the details and information provided. I have no objection to the application and make no further comments. Scientific Officer Having reviewed the application submission and the ECP records I am able to confirm that there is no objection on the grounds of land contamination. Also, there is no requirement for further contaminated land information to be provided, or for contaminated land planning conditions to be recommended in relation to this application.
Strategic Planning & Regeneration (DBC)	Response awaited.
Waste Services (DBC)	Response awaited.
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	UPDATED ADVICE: 08.06.2021 Thank you for providing me with the report and section '1.1 Parking spaces & Location of Residence' Illustrating the parking. The report was not included within the documents provided online for comment which is why it was unclear. Now the parking has been sorted due to the abundance of communal parking which was mentioned in my response. Following the report, HCC Highways has no further comment on the application as there will be no impact on the adjacent highway network. Therefore we would not wish to restrict a grant of permission for the application ORIGINAL ADVICE Proposal Change of use to house of multiple occupancy Decision Interim The application is for the change of use to house of multiple occupancy at 40 Valleyside, Hemel Hempstead. The site is at the end of a dead-end street but from observations it seems to lack dedicated

	parking other than that of communal parking adjacent. Within the application form it states that there will be 3 parking spaces. HCC Highways would like to see on a scaled drawing the location of these 3 parking spaces to access it's viability for parked cars. The dwelling also lack drawings on the location of secure cycle parking which is recommended owing to the increased number of people in the property and lack of car parking for each dwelling. Therefore, HCC Highways would like to see diagrams illustrating the location of vehicle parking and secure cycle parking on site. Once this has been provided, HCC Highways can fully comment on this application.
Affinity Water - Three Valleys Water PLC	Response awaited.
Thames Water	

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
16	19	0	19	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
34 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	at 34 object to the application of MOH. Parking provided for 3 cars? That allocated parking Space will be filled with at least seven maybe more bins in this space black bin blue bins and food bins which will be lovely in the hot weather. So a potential of 14 people residing at number 40 would also give you the potential of 14 cars extra in the street when parking is overcrowded already makes way for hazards for large vehicles or emergency vehicles to access Valleyside. Mr Patel paid an amount of money to have variation of deed which would allow for multiple occupancy or a single family as the houses were designed for. But this does not mean that other rules and regulations can be flouted example keeping the building to fit in with the rest of the area which it does not. There is no chimney on number 40 which again looks odd to not in keeping and there is just a sagging patch in the middle of the roof which looks structurally unstable. There has been suffering due to this build with the constant disregard to residents close by with mental health the wall at the end of the building with an apex into the alleyway encroaching onto public land with unsightly patching up of an old wall that should've been fixed two mortgages ago and also screws and

	sharp objects and unsightly filler filling up gaps in brickwork and what can I say pretty shoddy work. The public path at the side of Valleyside has like I said been encroached upon holes and everything dug for foundation and very poorly and rectified after the build and yeah it's a trip hazard and I've turned out my ankle myself in that area and another sign of just disregard disregard to the local residents. The plan for this site at number 40 Valleyside was meant to be multiple occupancy home all along before the application was even accepted the house had been completely gutted chimneys stairs just a shell so the applications from then on were just part of the deceitful plan I feel that was being carried out. There is absolutely no regard to the wildlife area that we live in the families that could bring their children up in this safe Rural beautiful area is it's going to be spoilt with pollution cars Which will be detrimental to the wildlife, residents health and the area itself. In section 254 of the Housing act mental health should be be a concern for people making the applications and the impact that it's going to have on these people there are two that I know of myself being one of them and others that have declined severely with their mental health due to that the trouble stress and noise caused and will continue with new residents in number 40. I feel the next thing to do is involve Mike Penning and the media not because of progression but because of the detrimental effects of this build on the progression of a natural family community. Are Water pipes being checked for blockage from building debris we have had some issues in the road. This build was always going to be multiple occupancy MrPatel has the intention all along to have 7 rooms getting the property back to breeze blocks before build has even been approved Besides the house of many colours not fitting in and very poorly finished. The residue of damage from building work is awful. I recently had an ambulance crew trying to use the alleyway next to 40 Valleyside and it is so poorly rectified the stretcher nearly toppled also walking on it is no better. I cannot believe the council are going to allow this build applied for with utter deceit on his eventual plans for this once lovely family home. The developer seems to have been allowed to flout any rulings with boundary wall in such bad repair, it has been there since at least 1969! Please let's have our family home back.
64 Varney Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LR	I would like to register an objection to application for planning permission to allow 40 Valleyside to be used as a house of multiple occupancy under the following grounds: 1. The property has been further converted in advance of the application for a HMO (21/00737/FUL) and in contravention of the originally permitted application for extension (4/01890/19/FHA) in order to maximise profit and make a mockery of the planning department as a Fait Accompli if the application is passed. 2. There is not adequate provision of parking for what would be likely to be a minimum of 7 persons and potentially up to 14 persons at the property, any of which could be vans or other work/trade based large vehicles which will have to overflow into neighbouring areas including Varney road, which is already showing increased parking caused by a HMO at 68 Varney road.

	3. The planning department has the power to order the return of the development to comply with the original plans (4/01890/19/FHA) before considering any further changes or developments. There are other developments where such orders have been successfully applied and this development is no exception. I believe any diligent appraisal of all the facts in consideration this application should leave no option but to decline the application, at the very least until all the pertinent points of objection are addressed.
26 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	This my objection to the Planning Application of 21/00737/FUL being a local resident of the road in question. In 2019, planning application No. 4/01890/19/FHA was granted, to extend the 40 Valleyside property into five bedrooms, a lounge, kitchen and a bathroom. Now the developer has submitted a request (No. 21/00737/FUL) to change the use of said property into a multiple occupancy. In the new request, the submitted plans show that instead of the following the plans for which approval had been granted, the developer has instead converted the said property has converted it into seven studio flats. It seems likely that the developer has deliberately deceived the local planning department with the application 4/01890/19/FHA has intended this all along, plus has already started the process of advertising these seven studio flats for rent prior the property has been granted approval with two of the studios already being rented out. The property adjoins the Shrubhill Common Local Nature Reserve, and it is not usual to see wildlife shall as Foxes, Badgers, Deer and Bats go past the house front door and fly around the property. Adding seven studio flats for transient residents will significantly increase noise, litter, and impact on the children who have to go past to play on Shrubhill Common. Parking is also fairly congested. The developer claims that the property has space for three parking slots, this is incorrect with a large vehicle parked there, there was no space for any other vehicle, let alone for a third vehicle. The developer clearly intends for his residents to take up the already limited parking spaces used by the existing local residents of the adjacent flats, with increased parking congestion there could be problems with rubbish collection or emergency services access. The developer is not adbiding with the deed of variation that was signed and dated on 7th July 2020.
36 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	In 2019 Mr Patel was granted planning permission to extend this family house into 5 bedrooms, a kitchen, a lounge and a bathroom (4/01890/19/FHA). We can see from this application (21/00737/FUL) that instead, he converted the house into 7 studio bedsits. Was he deliberately deceitful in the previous application? Deeds of conveyance state that owners are "Not to use the land otherwise than for the purpose of a single private dwellinghouse". The

	reason for this is that the street consists of family homes. Converting a property into an HMO will destroy the character of the street. Deeds of conveyance also state that owners are "Not to do or keep or suffer to be done or kept on the land any act or thing which may be or become a nuisance or annoyance or cause inconvenience to the Council or other owners or occupiers of neighbouring dwellings or which may tend to lessen or depreciate the value of the dwellings in the neighbourhood". The developer has always acknowledged that his actions will depreciate the value of neighbouring properties, so this clearly violates this conveyance. The reason for this depreciation is that replacing a single residence with 7 studio flats will result in significantly more noise, litter, and congestion. It will clearly adversely affect the character of the neighbourhood. Parking. The application states that the property has 3 parking spaces. This is incorrect. With the developer's SUV parked in the parking space, there was not room for a second, let alone a third car. Once the rubbish bins are put out, the lack of parking will be even more acute. Dacorum Parking Standards supplementary planning document Nov 2020 states: "Insufficient parking can result in on-street parking stress and unsafe or obstructive parking, with high levels of frustration for residents and businesses". And that C3 Dwelling Houses Studio or bedsits in Accessibility Zone 3 should have 1.25 allocated or 1 unallocated parking spaces each. Additionally, Residential Character Area HCA3 states that new development proposals should have adequate off-street spaces. This property should have 7 parking spaces but does not. The new residents will cause considerable parking congestion, and potentially impact rubbish collection and emergency services access. This will certainly lead to ongoing high levels of frustration for most existing residents when they start to need to park in neighbouring roads or find they are no longer able to turn their car around at the end of the road. The application states that the work to convert this property into a large HMO has not already started. This is false. The application states that there are no biodiversity features adjacent to the site. This is false - it is adjacent to Shrubhill Common nature reserve. Access to the nature reserve from this end of Valleyside is just past this property, so children going to play on the common will need to walk past it. Has the property been tested for acoustic insulation? Has the water board confirmed the sewage systems can cope? Is it electrically safe with all the electrical appliances for 7 studio flats? Overall, this application has been made without regard to the impact to existing residents and I request that not only it be rejected, but Mr Patel be required to restore the interior of the house back to the family home he was granted planning permission for in 2019 and be denied from making any further planning applications in Dacorum.
35 Varney Road	I formerly lived at 38 Valleyside and am aware that all of these

Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LW	properties were built as 4 bedroom terraced houses and not designed for multiple occupancy. This development is entirely out of keeping with the local environment and has caused great upset to local residents. There is a parking space for only one vehicle outside the property and access to the front is via a footpath only. Although I live in Varney Road I believe the overspill of vehicle parking requirements will impact Varney Road severely. This is an entirely unnecessary development and inappropriate for this area.
16 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	The developer has ignored his previous permission (to which many neighbours originally objected before an IT fault apparently erased the original comments) to turn this family home into a series of 5 bedsits, and has instead created 7 studio flats. Giving permission to use this property as a HMO will have a significantly detrimental effect on both the neighbours and wider local area. Our household OBJECTS in the STRONGEST possible terms to this development. The main concerns we have (in no particular order) are: Parking - this is already extremely limited. Adding a potential 14 extra cars (assuming each studio flat houses up to 2 adults) to the road but only providing parking for 1 or 2 will create significant problems. Litter & pollution. Noise, both from increased traffic and from people living in a small space. Change to the character of the area, which is currently a quiet, safe family area. Increased traffic on an access road, not built for heavy traffic. Impact on the adjoining nature conservation area, which already has heavy use from walkers, horse riders, motorcycles, quad bikes etc. Invasion of privacy of next door properties. Reduced privacy for some tenants of the property as windows have been added at eye level alongside a public path. Potential increase in crime that comes with a frequently changing, lower income population, which is likely in small, low rent properties like these studio flats. Strain on local amenities - schools, doctors, dentists etc are already quite full, and with significant other local developments planned nearby, these will soon be unable to cope. I would like to point out that these properties have a covenant forbidding their use as HMO. While I realise this is not taken into consideration for planning permission, it is there for a good reason! These are designed as family homes, and turning them into crowded HMO properties will cause many issues, such as as those mentioned above, as well as other concerns that planning will not take into account, but please do be aware that they exist!
2 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	The original plan, conversion to 5 bedsits, was bad enough due to the additional the strain of the local area parking. As this has changed to now be 7 apartments, parking for an addition 7-14 cars will be required. The roads around the area are already busy enough as it is without the

	addition traffic. The look and shape of the building as been changed so it no longer fits with the look at feel of the rest of the properties on the row. Consequently multiple opening windows have been added onto the side of the build that overlook the footpath. When these windows are opened they will obstruct the path making it difficult for people to use.
56 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	As I understand the work has gone ahead without permission from the right people. My main concern is the parking of 7 new dwellings and only 2 parking spaces provided. This will equal a large amount of new vehicles needing a parking space.
58 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	Planning permission was given for 5 bed sits and hes decided to build 7 studio apartments instead. Hes also put windows on the side of the house that open outwards and some are so low that if open anyone walking up the path could catch themselves or if wearing a skirt the could see right up it. There isn't enough parking for the people that already live here and if more cars come there will be nowhere for anyone to park. The rubbish is already piling up and it'll be a lot worse if permission is granted as they'll fill their bins up as well as possibly ours.
54 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	I would like to register against the planning permission to allow this to be used as a house of multiple occupancy. First of all, what the owner has made the house into now is well against what the original planning permission stated as per (4/01890/19/FHA). It shows not only greed but the fact that indeed they had clear intentions to convert the house into a 7 studio flats instead of a 5 bedroom house. It is simply wrong to grant permission for this to go ahead. There will be several tenants who will occupy the new studio flats which will cause noise disruption on a continuous basis. With people moving and coming, you cannot guarantee anything. There is already a big struggle to find parking on the road and makes is very difficult for those who have children and need to arrange school drop off and collection. If all 7 studio flat tenants require at least 1 parking space then that will prove to be a massive problem let alone thinking about whether this could actually be double and 14 spaces could be required. There is a concern with privacy as there are so many windows and it is unfair to have multiple occupancy agreed. We are just about managing the rubbish and waste right now and I believe this will only worsen as result of this proposal. I am not trying to be difficult but money is not everything in this world, living peacefully is more important to us neighbours. Please feel free to drive down the road Valleyside yourself and you will see that our concerns are actually valid and it is out right selfish for 40 Valleyside to NOT follow their original approved plans because this simply shows that they had pure intentions to convert this for multiple occupancy in the first place. The road is very congested already and this is not going to be a safe place for us especially in case of an emergency, you would find it difficult to get through. I am very uncomfortable with the proposal and ask yourself Mr Durrant to carefully consider this application with due care & attention as our points are valid.

	Best wishes I would like to register against the planning permission to allow this to be used as a house of multiple occupancy. First of all, what the owner has made the house into now is well against what the original planning permission stated as per (4/01890/19/FHA). It shows not only greed but the fact that indeed they had clear intentions to convert the house into a 7 studio flats instead of a 5 bedroom house. It is simply wrong to grant permission for this to go ahead. There will be several tenants who will occupy the new studio flats which will cause noise disruption on a continuous basis. With people moving and coming, you cannot guarantee anything. There is already a big struggle to find parking on the road and makes is very difficult for those who have children and need to arrange school drop off and collection. If all 7 studio flat tenants require at least 1 parking space then that will prove to be a massive problem let alone thinking about whether this could actually be double and 14 spaces could be required. There is a concern with privacy as there are so many windows and it is unfair to have multiple occupancy agreed. We are just about managing the rubbish and waste right now and I believe this will only worsen as result of this proposal. I am not trying to be difficult but money is not everything in this world, living peacefully is more important to us neighbours. Please feel free to drive down the road Valleyside yourself and you will see that our concerns are actually valid and it is out right selfish for 40 Valleyside to NOT follow their original approved plans because this simply shows that they had pure intentions to convert this for multiple occupancy in the first place. The road is very congested already and this is not going to be a safe place for us especially in case of an emergency, you would find it difficult to get through. I am very uncomfortable with the proposal and ask yourself Mr Gibbs to carefully consider this application with due care & attention as our points are valid. Best wishes
37 Varney Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LW	We strongly object to this planning application for the following reasons: 1. Parking - The application states 3 parking spaces, which is not the case. There is an area at the rear of the property for potentially 2 small cars. I assume the applicant is suggesting that the space at the rear of the garage could be used as a space. However, this space should be not be used as a space as it contravenes rule 244 of the highway code, where a car cannot be parked on a pavement where it may bloke pedestrian, wheelchairs, partially sighted and pram access. The HMO has 7 rooms, many of which are double sized rooms, which could result in up to 14 residents. There is simply not enough parking in valleyside or the surrounding roads. There is already a significant issue with parking in the local area and many occasions residents are parking on verges and damaging grassed areas. 2. Need for the property - We would question the need for such a type of property in this road. The local area is primarily families and has

	seen an increase in young families moving in over the last few years. This is likely due to the local amenities, such as the parks, play areas, community areas, sense of community and schools. This type of property in this area would not appeal to young professionals and there is no higher education establishments nearby which would bring in potential residents. There is also currently several other builds occurring in the hemel area; there is currently 8 single apartments being built on Long Chaulden, approximately 500 metres away. There is also a huge building project on the Marlowes, with hundreds of properties being built. Also there is a block of flats being completed at the junction of Two Waters Road and London Road. 3. Noise, Rubbish and Traffic - the addition of 7-14 people will cause significant increase in noise, rubbish and traffic in the road and the surrounding area. It is clear that these properties were not built with this intention, and it would be irresponsible to allow this number of people to accommodate a property initially designed for a medium sized family. 4. Property value - If this application is granted, it will have a serious knock effect to the valuation of properties in the area. Potential buyers will be reluctant to purchase properties nearby. Also see point 5. 5. Dangerous precedent - If this application is granted, it will be seen as a green light for other developers to undertake similar projections to other properties in the area. Valleyside has several of these large 3 storey houses, if this application goes ahead, I have no doubt future projects like this one will occur. 6. Mental Health and Wellbeing - granting this application will have serious ramifications for the health and wellbeing of local residents. Due to the objections registered by ourselves and others, there is no desire to allow this application to go ahead. Granting it would cause undue stress and anxiety to the local residents, which will have a negative effect on our health and wellbeing. Our final point is of particular concern; on section of the application form, it clearly states that the 'work or change of use' has not already started. This is clearly not true. Viewing the property from the road, it is clearly visible that the conversion to the 7 bedroomed HMO has already taken place. All the residents in the immediate area could also testify that work has been ongoing been from approximately September 2020. We strongly object to this planning application for the following reasons: 1. Parking - The application states 3 parking spaces, which is not the case. There is an area at the rear of the property for potentially 2 small cars. I assume the applicant is suggesting that the space at the rear of the garage could be used as a space. However, this space should be not be used as a space as it contravenes rule 244 of the highway code, where a car cannot be parked on a pavement where it may bloke pedestrian, wheelchairs, partially sighted and pram access. The HMO has 7 rooms, many of which are double sized rooms, which could result in up to 14 residents. There is simply not enough parking in valleyside or the surrounding roads. There is already a significant issue

	with parking in the local area and many occasions residents are parking on verges and damaging grassed areas. 2. Need for the property - We would question the need for such a type of property in this road. The local area is primarily families and has seen an increase in young families moving in over the last few years. This is likely due to the local amenities, such as the parks, play areas, community areas, sense of community and schools. This type of property in this area would not appeal to young professionals and there is no higher education establishments nearby which would bring in potential residents. There is also currently several other builds occurring in the hemel area; there is currently 8 single apartments being built on Long Chaulden, approximately 500 metres away. There is also a huge building project on the Marlowes, with hundreds of properties being built. Also there is a block of flats being completed at the junction of Two Waters Road and London Road. 3. Noise, Rubbish and Traffic - the addition of 7-14 people will cause significant increase in noise, rubbish and traffic in the road and the surrounding area. It is clear that these properties were not built with this intention, and it would be irresponsible to allow this number of people to accommodate a property initially designed for a medium sized family. 4. Property value - If this application is granted, it will have a serious knock effect to the valuation of properties in the area. Potential buyers will be reluctant to purchase properties nearby. Also see point 5. 5. Dangerous precedent - If this application is granted, it will be seen as a green light for other developers to undertake similar projections to other properties in the area. Valleyside has several of these large 3 storey houses, if this application goes ahead, I have no doubt future projects like this one will occur. 6. Mental Health and Wellbeing - granting this application will have serious ramifications for the health and wellbeing of local residents. Due to the objections registered by ourselves and others, there is no desire to allow this application to go ahead. Granting it would cause undue stress and anxiety to the local residents, which will have a negative effect on our health and wellbeing. Our final point is of particular concern; on section of the application form, it clearly states that the 'work or change of use' has not already started. This is clearly not true. Viewing the property from the road, it is clearly visible that the conversion to the 7 bedroomed HMO has already taken place. All the residents in the immediate area could also testify that work has been ongoing been from approximately September 2020.
29 Varney Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LW	I strongly object to the proposal to change the use of this property to a HMO. Not only has the developer bent every rule to get this build off the ground from previous applications this change of use has clearly always been their intention. Id like to draw your attention to the points below : *From the Delegated Report back in January the planning officer states

	"the roof of the extension will be flat" in order to stop blocking sunlight into neighbouring properties. This has clearly been ignored because walking past there today that roof is pitched at least 20 degrees if not more. *The huge extension which overshadows next door has already significantly devalued neighbouring properties through loss of light, privacy and not being in keeping with the local area. Changing the use of this property to a HMO would further decrease value to these. * The applicant has lied on on this application stating the property already has 3 parking spaces. If you visited the site you will clearly see there is only space outside for one car. A previous owner of this property has confirmed there is only one parking space in an area where parking is already a problem without adding the additional strain this change of use will put on the area. *My understanding is there is a Covenant on the houses in Valleyside which blocks this type of change of use. Having had a quick look at previous applications from this developer on 40 Valleyside , how they have been rejected , amended then accepted and seeing what has actually been done there construction wise i am concerned this developer is ignoring what is actually approved and being allowed to do so.
20 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	It is our understanding that the original plan would have provided five additional flats, however it now seems the applicant may have exceeded the scope of the plans and provided seven flats. That is surely a breach of planning rules ? Only two parking spaces have been provided by the applicant, so we can expect that at least five additional vehicles will need to find parking within the Valleyside or Varney Road areas. These areas are already struggling to keep up with parking requirements now. The additional vehicles will undoubtedly also increase noise nuisance in what is a fairly quiet secluded area. We would also be concerned that access by large emergency vehicles could be impeded if there are too many vehicles clustered together, especially near the Valleyside flats adjacent to 40 Valleyside. Furthermore we have concerns about additional strain on the sewage system, there have been several incidents of blockages observed fairly recently. We are concerned about, what consideration has been given to rubbish collection for this site and about potential litter and vermin issues if this

	is not done properly,with all those flats in one house. We ask that the application be rejected. If this is not the outcome we ask that consideration be given to capping the total number of motor vehicles associated with the address. Thank you.
14 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	We wish to object to the planning application for several reasons 1. These properties have a covenant in the deeds which state they must remain 'one family' homes. This applicant applied for permission to build a two store extension on this property previously. On Appeal, permission was granted for this. The new plan is for HMO showing 7 self-contained bedsits with a communal area. This would contravene this covenant and would have future implications on the other properties, which in turn, could make this possible for other houses on this road, which would be detrimental to both the area and the families living in the houses, as they were originally meant to be used. 2. Permission was originally granted to extend the property as per the plans submitted yet the new application shows the 'new' current layout as completely different to the originals plans allowed. For example, there is no kitchen in this family home just seven en-suite bedrooms and a communal area currently, see below comment. The new plans allow for a kitchenette to be added to each room. This would suggest to me there was never any intention to keep it as a family home as the property, it would appear, has already been converted to HMO status without permission. I would also point out that this work is already being carried out and the kitchens being installed. It would appear to be' fait accompli'. I am unsure how this work has been completed without council inspection to notice that it doesn't agree with the plans. 3. The plans show a communal internal area with a kitchenette. This would suggest that these are to be used as communal bedsit living or are they to be sold as individual studio apartments. The HMO has 7 rooms, many of which are double sized rooms, which could, in reality, result in up to 14 residents, which in turn, could result in an additional 14 cars attempting to park in Valleyside or Varney Road, which already has overspill of parking. There is simply not enough parking in Valleyside or the surrounding roads. This could cause obstruction for services vehicles and emergency vehicles. 4. The Dacorum Local Plan already has large scale plans for many types of accommodation in the near vicinity, so it is not necessary. If these are not to be sold but rented out, it will create hostel/bedsit/halfway house living, this being apparent with the communal living area with kitchen. It would not be in keeping with the current area/residents to allow this type of living in this area. 5. The windows on the side elevation, next to a public footpath, are not the ones on the original proposed plan nor are they in the position stated. They are low level on the ground floor and open outwards onto the footpath creating a health and safety issue.

	6. The application appears to have some issues:- 1. Section 6 -Existing use - dwelling house, currently vacant - a dwelling house with no kitchen just 7 rooms with bedrooms 2. Section 9 - Proposed parking - 3 spaces, I do not think this is the case, 2 at best. 3. Section 16 - Residential/Dwelling units - Does your proposal include the gain, loss or change of use of residential units? No - surely the answer is Yes, from 1 dwelling to 7 4. Section 24 - Authority Employee/Member. This has been answered yes but no details of the person/persons have been added as required. Please consider the points above but the main concern is allowing a change of use of these covenanted properties and how this would change the current residential status quo
8 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	Hello Sir, We strongly believe there is definitely not enough space for car parking more than two. This location is a very quiet cul-de-sac. That's the primary reason for the residents buying the properties and staying in to enjoy nature and privacy. Planning permission for 7 studio flats in a single terraced house is ridiculous as there is not enough space. These houses in a row are built as a family home by DCC with the original vision of a new townhome. The cut alongside number 40 is a public right of way, side windows opening on to this would be a hazard. There is no consideration for next door neighbours either as next door family won't be able to use their garden at all considering the overlooking issues and too much noise to the neighbourhood. Many Thanks
58 Varney Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LR	It appears from initial construction it was always intended to make the property an HMO only bigger than the other 2 in the area, which is devious and underhand. There will be a great lack of parking as Valley Side residents already park in Varney Road which suffers from extra cars in the road due in part to its HMO. Being self contained dwellings for probably 2 adults each it will attract more car owners not young single people like more traditional HMOs. CCTV cameras have already been installed covering the public footpaths with no signage nor, if it is an HMO will it likely be possible to view the recordings which I believe is a legal requirement for CCTV so placed.
24 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	4/01425/19/FHA - GROUND FLOOR REAR EXTENSION WITH FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION Planning permission refused 26 July 2019 4/01890/19/FHA - Two storey rear extension 6th August 2019 Permission GRANTED 21/00737/FUL - Change of use to house of multiple occupancy I wish to object to this Change of use. I am genuinely concerned that the alterations to convert to a 7 bed HMO have already been carried out prior to planning permission even

	being considered, let alone being granted. The planning application makes no mention of the demolition of the single garage at the rear of the property. A neighbouring garage conversion was forced to retain the up-and-over garage door to ensure the property was "in keeping" with the other properties in the close. Why does this rule not apply to this application? The removal of the garage only provides parking for 2 vehicles, which means additional vehicles will be adding to an already overcrowded close. The new extension side wall clearly exceeds the property boundary and protrudes into the footpath, our public right of way. The public right of way was illegally obstructed and impassable for approximately a year while building work took place. 7 sets of appliances will place a heavy load on the electrical circuits. Has this load been calculated and authorised by the relevant authorities? 7 to 14 people will have a big impact on the drains and sewage system; a system that is already under strain and has received many visits to resolve blockages in the past. Shrubhill Common is a nature conservation area and the comings and goings of up to 14 people will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife of birds, foxes and protected badgers, especially as #40 is adjacent to the wooded area of Shrubhill. 4/01425/19/FHA was refused due to loss of light to the neighbouring properties. Superficial changes to the design led to permission being granted (4/01890/19/FHA). However, I think allowing a 2nd storey extension still robs too much light from other properties. My opinion is that the developer is driven by greed with a total disregard for Council Planning, the current community of residents, and the effect on amenities and services. This application should be REFUSED.
56 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	The fact that the owner has gone ahead and completed the works before applying for permission is more than enough reason for the council to decline his modified application.
10 Valleyside Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LN	I object to the change in occupancy. 5 bedsits was bad enough but 7 studio flats is ridiculous. There is not enough parking and this is a quiet cul-de-sac. The increase in traffic will endanger children and pets, there is insufficient parking for all these additional residents and 7 studio apartments is quite simply greed and gives no consideration for local residents.