

**ITEM NUMBER: 5a**

<b>20/03557/FUL</b>	<b>Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 7 flats (1 x 1 bed and 6x 2 bed) and associated landscaping.</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>1 Park Road, Hemel Hempstead</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent</b>	<b>Mr Wood/Emma Adams and Partners Ltd</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Robert Freeman</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	<b>N/a</b>	<b>Boxmoor</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>The application has been referred to the Development Management Committee at the request of Councillor Uttley. Councillor Uttley is concerned with the scale of development and its impact on neighbouring units.</b>	

**1. RECOMMENDATION – That planning permission be GRANTED.**

**2. SUMMARY**

- 2.1 The intensification in residential use of this site is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies NP1, CS1, CS2 and CS4 of the Core Strategy.
- 2.2 The proposed layout, scale and design of this residential scheme is considered to be appropriate and should not result in any significant detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy
- 2.3 The site is suitable for car free residential development in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

- 3.1 The application site is located at the junction of Park Road and Charles Street and to the west of Hemel Hempstead town centre. The site is a corner plot and is presently occupied by a single dwelling.
- 3.2 The dwelling appears as a high chalet bungalow from Park Road set at an angle to the highway and providing views down Charles Street. A change in topography across the site results in a lower ground floor level to the property and garden. The site benefits from an access onto Charles Street.

**4. PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The proposal involves the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of an L shaped building comprising 6 x 2 bed flats and 1 x 1 bed flats. The original proposals were for the provision of 8 units on the site and have been amended to reduce the scheme by a single 1 bed flat.

## **5. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 5.1 Two previous applications for four houses (4/02261/19/FUL) and eight apartments (20/00514/FUL) have been withdrawn.

## **6. REPRESENTATIONS**

### Consultation responses

- 6.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

### Neighbour notification/site notice responses

- 6.2 These are reproduced in full in Appendix B

## **7. PLANNING POLICIES**

Main Documents:

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

Relevant Policies:

Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development  
CS1 - Distribution of Development  
CS2 – Selection of Development Sites  
CS4 – The Towns and Large Villages  
CS8 – Sustainable Transport  
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  
CS26 – Green Infrastructure  
CS29 – Sustainable Design and Construction  
CS31 – Water Management  
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality  
CS35 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Car Parking Standards SPD (November 2020)  
Energy Efficiency and Conservation  
Water Conservation<sup>8</sup>

## **8. CONSIDERATIONS**

### Policy and Principle

- 8.1. The application site is located within the built up area of Hemel Hempstead where the construction of new dwellings would be encouraged in accordance with Policies NP1, CS1, CS2 and CS4 of the Core Strategy. There is further support to optimise the use of urban land in accordance with the NPPF and Saved Policy 10 from the Local Plan 1991-2011 including the intensification of existing brownfield land in sustainable locations.
- 8.2 Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy would encourage such developments to make appropriate arrangements to ensure that they are accessible, prioritise the needs of pedestrians and cyclists over the private car and provide safe, sufficient and convenient parking based on car parking standards within the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020).
- 8.3 All developments are expected to be well designed in the context of the site and surrounding land in accordance with Policies CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS13. This supports the government's objectives for a high standard of design, delivered at optimum densities and in the right locations.
- 8.4 The proposal would make a small contribution towards the delivery of the housing target of 430 new homes per annum over the plan period under Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.5 Sustainable design and construction is an essential part of the Council's response to challenges of climate change, natural resource depletion, habitat loss and wider environmental and social issues. Accordingly the proposed dwelling has been assessed against the requirements of Policies CS29, CS31 and CS32 of the Core Strategy

#### Layout and Design

- 8.6 High quality design is required in the context of the site and surroundings to comply with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS13 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.7 The proposed development is considered to be appropriate in terms of its design, bulk, scale, site coverage and use of materials and would make a positive contribution to the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy. The proposed building would be similar in height and scale to the traditional two storey dwellings opposite the site in Park Road and would step down in height to the frontage of Charles Street to reflect changes in the site topography. This allows for a lower ground level of accommodation to be provided.
- 8.8 The proposed development would provide a reasonable level of internal space for future occupants exceeding the requirements of Saved Policy 19 of the Local Plan and reflecting the emergence of the National Minimum Space Standards.

#### Impact on Amenity

- 8.9 The proposed dwellings have been carefully sited and designed to ensure that there is no substantial harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.
- 8.10 The most significant impact on residential amenity will be that upon the residential unit at 15 Charles Street to the east of the building. This dwelling and the neighbouring property were constructed following the grant of planning permission in 1988 (4/01820/FUL) and has been constructed upon the boundary of the site with 1 Park Road. There are three windows within the flank elevation of the property serving the hall and stairs and a first floor bathroom.

- 8.11 The proximity of development to these windows would be reduced from approximately 6.5m (first floor bathroom) to 8m (split level stairs and landing) to some 1.8m as a result of this development and as a consequence there would be a reduction in daylight and sunlight to the rooms served. The Council seeks to protect daylight to main habitable rooms within the properties such as kitchens, lounge/dining rooms and bedroom. In this context the loss of light to these flank windows would not significantly harm the amenities of the occupants in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.12 The scheme has been amended to remove windows immediately adjacent to 15 Charles Street and upon the flank elevation of the rear wing of the building. Where windows are located on the east elevation facing the neighbouring land the internal arrangement of the property has been laid out to provide circulation space at the rear of the building and to ensure that these may be served by obscure glazed windows.
- 8.13 As a result of these the proposals would not result in any significant overlooking of neighbouring properties and are not considered to be detrimental to the privacy of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3.

#### Access and Parking

- 8.14 The primary concern of neighbouring residential properties is that the proposed development does not provide any parking for the occupants of the proposed units and as a result is likely to lead to conditions which are prejudicial to highways safety. This view is not shared by the County Council as highway authority.
- 8.15 The assessment of this application provides a test of the Council's commitment to the development of car free residential developments. The Council's Car Parking Standards SPD (2020) makes it clear that "car free residential development may be considered in high accessibility locations" It also clarifies that the level of parking provided may be omitted or reduced on the basis of the type of development provided.
- 8.16 The site is located 45m to the east of the boundary between Accessibility Zone 1 and Accessibility Zone 3 in the Car Parking Standards SPD. The applicants make a case for the site to be considered as a "highly accessible" location and as such one which is capable of being developed with a car free development. They also provide evidence that the type of unit being developed results in a low demand for parking. The development of a car free scheme would therefore be in accordance with the sustainable transport objectives in the NPPF as set out in Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020).
- 8.17 The application site is within a comfortable 10 minutes (up to 800m) walking distance of a range of facilities within the town centre and locality in accordance with guidance in Manual for Streets (MfS) These facilities including a number of educational premises, healthcare facilities, leisure, bus and retail services. The site is within 250m of Lime Grove Day Nursery (200m) Hemel Hempstead School (220m) and South Hill Primary School (250m) whilst Riverside shopping centre (270m) Riverside Bus Interchange (290m) and Tesco Express (550m) are all well within acceptable walking distances. Boxmoor Common is located approximately 900m from the application site and is still a comfortable walk (11mins) from the site.
- 8.18 It is evident that the A4146 Leighton Buzzard Road would not provide a significant barrier to pedestrian access as there is a designated pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of the Charles Street and Cotterells junction.

- 8.19 One can only conclude that the site scores highly in terms of its accessibility and provides one of a limited number of opportunities to pursue car free development within the Borough.
- 8.20 Car ownership levels in this neighbourhood area are low with 42% of all flat owners within the area not owning a vehicle<sup>1</sup>. This demonstrates that a large number of people already live successfully in the area without needing to own a car. In the event that a car is required by residents the scheme is within an easy walk of Enterprise Car Club on Hillfield Road where one can access a range of vehicles (including electric vehicles) on a 'pay as you go' basis.
- 8.21 The NPPF requires accessibility and local car ownership levels to be taken into account when setting parking standards and as set out the site is both highly accessible in transport terms with excellent opportunities for travel by non-car modes. For these reasons, it is considered that residents would not need to own a car and that the access arrangements for the development should be considered to be satisfactory in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

### Ecology and Biodiversity

- 8.22 The application is accompanied by an Ecological Survey which has established that there is a likelihood that the roof space of the property may have been used as a bat roost. Bats are a protected species and as such there will be a need to undertake further emergence surveys and provide mitigation to fulfil support and application for a bat licence from Natural England.

### Other Material Planning Considerations

#### *Sustainable Construction*

- 8.23 The proposals are not accompanied by any Sustainability Statement in accordance with Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy. The absence of this statement does not prevent the determination of the proposals although it would be useful to understand how the construction of this building would contribute to the aims and objectives of this policy and meet the requirements of the Energy Efficiency SPD and Water Conservation SPD. It is recommended that further details are secured by a planning condition.

#### *Trees*

- 8.24 The proposals will result in the removal of the existing tree at the junction of Park Road and Charles Street to facilitate development together with much of the existing hedgerow. This tree has a poor relationship to the existing dwelling and is considered to have limited amenity value. As such there would be no objection to its removal under Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy. The site is likely to be subject to additional landscaping which would compensate for the loss of existing landscaping.

### Impact on Infrastructure

- 8.25 Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards on-site, local and strategic infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council adopted its CIL schedule in February 2015 and this proposal would

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Census 2011 data for Dacorum 15 Middle Super Output Area (MSOA)

be liable for the payment of CIL. The site is located within Hemel Hempstead (Zone 3) and the current rate of indexation would require a payment of £131.10 per square metre.

### Consultation Responses

- 8.26 The bulk of objections to the scheme have been addressed above. There are additional concerns raised in relation to the intensification in the use of the site and potential for noise and disturbance and in relation to the adequacy of the bin storage provided.
- 8.27 The design and layout of the scheme have been designed to minimise any adverse impact on neighbours as a result of noise. There is a statutory framework for the protection of residents from noise and disturbance under Environmental Health legislation and the Council can enforce against statutory noise nuisances. This would not form a sound basis for the refusal of an application for planning permission.
- 8.28 A bin storage area is indicated upon the plans between the dwelling and a neighbouring garage on the southern boundary of the site. The space between the proposed building and neighbouring land would be sufficient in width to allow larger waste bins to be transported between the rear amenity area and Park Road and thus in principle bin storage can be provided. Further details of the bin storage area should be secured by condition.

## **9 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The proposal makes a more efficient use of an existing residential site close to the town centre and is considered to be sustainable development. It is supported by the NPPF and Policies NP1, CS1, CS2 and CS4 of the Core Strategy. The scheme is well designed in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and will make a small contribution to the housing land supply under Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy
- 9.2 The development would not have any significant detrimental impacts on the character and appearance of the area or the amenity of neighbouring residents in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan.
- 9.3 The highly accessible location is suitable for car free development in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

## **10 RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

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

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

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

### **Plans**

**1293-302 Revision B**

1293-305

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

3. **No development of the superstructure shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To make sure that the appearance of the building is suitable and that it contributes to the character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

4. **Prior to the demolition (or any roof works) of any of the existing buildings on site, further bat survey(s) shall be undertaken by a qualified professional and in accordance with the submitted Preliminary Ecological Assessment and Bat Survey by 4 Acre Ecology Limited to establish the extent of bat activity on the site and the need for mitigation measures. Details of the surveys and any mitigation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should bats be found, the appropriate mitigation measures and contingency plans shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.**

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 Policies CS26 and CS29 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy and Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

INFORMATIVE – The submission of information to the LPA does not over-ride the need to secure any required bat licences from Natural England

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

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

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

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

**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. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until full details of the arrangements for the storage of refuse have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The proposed bin storage shall be provided fully in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation and shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the appropriate provision for the storage of waste in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

#### **APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES**

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Conservation and Design	<p>The existing street has a mixture of early 20<sup>th</sup> century houses to the west side and to the east post war houses. Number 1 is one of these being a single storey bungalow to Park Rd and two storeys due to the slope to Charles St. It is constructed in brick and has a tiled roof. We would not object to its demolition. A more interesting villa can be seen opposite on Charles St, which although converted to flats and with unsympathetic roof materials and fenestration, makes a positive contribution to both Park Rd and Charles St providing a terminus to Park Rd.</p> <p>The proposal has addressed the weaknesses in the previous design and as such resolved many of our concerns. We would however continue to recommend that chimney features be added to break up the ridge line. It would also be recommended that slate be used rather than concrete tiles for the roofing. It may also be useful to reconsider the bedroom layout to flat 6 which appears to be dominated with corridors.</p> <p>The planning officer should carefully consider the other impacts with regards to the development in particular the scale of the building within the plot and the general two storey character of the area although we note there are two and single storey houses with dormers nearby.</p> <p>Recommendation: The proposals have been reviewed in light of the previous comments and addressed our concerns with regards to the design. External materials and finishes subject to approval.</p>
Hertfordshire County Council – Highways	Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish



to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:

#### CONDITIONS

1. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted vehicular and pedestrian (and cyclist) access to and egress from the adjoining highway shall be limited to the access(es) shown on drawing number 305 only. Any other access(es) or egresses shall be permanently closed, and the footway shall be reinstated in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, concurrently with the bringing into use of the new pedestrian accesses.

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

2. No part of the proposed structure shall overhang or encroach upon land to which highway rights apply and no gate shall open or extend over the highway.

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

#### HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES

1. 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:

<http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

2. 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:

<http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047

	<p>3. 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.</p> <p>Further information is available via the website:  <a href="https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-and-developer-information.aspx">https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-and-developer-information.aspx</a>.</p> <p><b>ANALYSIS</b></p> <p>This application is for Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of building containing 2x 1 bedroom flats and 6x 2 bedroom flats with associated landscaping (amended scheme)</p> <p><b>PARKING</b></p> <p>No off road car parking provision will be created by this application.</p> <p><b>ACCESS</b></p> <p>There is an existing vxo on Charles Street, giving access to the current garage. This will be made redundant by the development, since no off street parking will be provided therefore the kerb and surrounding footpath must be restored to the levels of the surrounding kerb and footpath. However, the existing gates will be retained, and two further sets of gates will be installed for pedestrian/cyclist access. These must not open onto the pavement and should only open inwards.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION:</b>  HCC as Highway Authority considers that this proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway, subject to the inclusion of the above planning condition's and informative notes.</p>
Environmental Health	<p>Having reviewed the documentation submitted with the above planning application and having considered the information held the by ECP team I have the following advice and recommendations in relation to land contamination.</p> <p>The development, if permitted, will not result in a change of land use and there is no former land use on or immediately adjacent to the application site that would be expected to result in ground contamination. As such the proposed development is not expected to introduce any new pathways of exposure to contamination and in any event the historical land use of the site as residential since it was first developed suggests that contamination would not be expected. As such, it is considered that the following contaminated land</p>

'discovery' planning condition shall be sufficient, if planning permission is to be granted. This provides for unexpected contamination originating from the application site, for example asbestos, or the migration of contamination from neighbouring sites, to be dealt with in an appropriate way.

Discovery Condition – Contaminated Land:  
Should any ground contamination be encountered during the construction of the development hereby approved (including groundworks), works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and a Contamination Remediation Scheme shall be submitted to (as soon as practically possible) and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Contamination Remediation Scheme shall detail all measures required to render this contamination harmless and all approved measures shall subsequently be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

Should no ground contamination be encountered or suspected upon the completion of the groundworks, a statement to that effect shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

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.

Informatives:  
To avoid future ground gas contamination on the site the material used to backfill the swimming pool should be filled with inert and non-putrescible material.

The safe and secure occupancy of the site, in respect of land contamination, lies with the developer.

The above condition is considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) & (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2018.

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

Trees and Woodlands	No objection.
---------------------	---------------

Thames Water	<p data-bbox="496 188 1428 224"><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p data-bbox="496 224 1428 492">With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services</a></p> <p data-bbox="496 526 1428 795">There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes</a>.</p> <p data-bbox="496 828 1428 1534">We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures will be undertaken to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the planning application, Thames Water would like the following informative attached to the planning permission: "A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 3577 9483 or by emailing <a href="mailto:trade.effluent@thameswater.co.uk">trade.effluent@thameswater.co.uk</a>. Application forms should be completed on line via <a href="http://www.thameswater.co.uk">www.thameswater.co.uk</a>. Please refer to the Wholesale; Business customers; Groundwater discharges section.</p> <p data-bbox="496 1568 1428 1769">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 data-bbox="496 1803 1428 2040">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</p>
--------------	---

	<p>Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.</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  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>
--	--

**APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES**

Address	Comments
4 Charles Street	<p>I object to the proposed demolition and proposed development of 8 apartments (2 one bedroom and 6 two bedroom) on the site of one bungalow.</p> <p>More details of the objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the proposed demolition and construction of 8 new dwellings (to house up to 28 people in place of one bungalow) as it would not be in keeping with the style of the existing properties on Park Road. Park Road is mainly made up of 1930s housing, and bungalows, not a modern building as proposed. Consideration needs to be given to the transition from bungalow dwellings on that side of the road and I am not sure that the height and scale of the proposed building provides an appropriate transition between the adjacent bungalows and those existing homes in Charles Street.</li> <li>2. I object to the proposed construction as I would lose privacy as my rooms facing Park Road are not currently directly overlooked and there would be significant overlooking from the proposed development into living rooms and, of more concern, into our first floor children's bedrooms.</li> <li>3. I object to the proposed planning on the grounds of increased traffic and parking issues as there is total lack of provision for parking on the proposed site. There are already limited permit parking spaces that would under increased demand from the residents and visitors to the proposed development. The 8 new properties do not have any parking onsite whereas the existing dwelling has its own contained parking for 3+ cars. There is no provision for 28-56 extra cars plus their guests assuming 1 car per resident.</li> <li>4. I object to the proposed development as it is proposed to replace a bungalow with 8 dwellings, increasing the population at least 8-fold and there will be increased noise and disturbance from those new residents.</li> </ol>

5. I cannot see from the plans that there is adequate storage on site for the rubbish bins each household has. I note also the comments from the Cupid Green site as to their concerns that the current provision may be inadequate. This would be a huge increase particularly on the day each week that the bins are collected. No other households on Park Road have to use the pavement, but I fear that for the houses for this proposed development they would, which would create a serious hazard for pavement users, particularly those in wheelchairs, mobility scooters and pushchairs/prams.

6. An important ground for objection is that bats and other wildlife including nesting birds are likely to be affected by this proposed development. I know that there are a number of bats in this area, I have seen bats flying around the eaves of these neighbouring properties at dusk and counted at least 20-30 sightings over the summer around 8/9pm in June-September 2019 and in late March/early April 2020. I am concerned that the proposed development will affect their roosts and also their commute to their roosts as the proposed development will not only demolish the building but also the trees on the roadside, which are in the line of travel of the bats. I believe that such a survey will demonstrate that the proposed development is likely to affect bat foraging and/or their commuting habitat.

My understanding is that the planning authority has a legal obligation to consider whether bats are likely to be affected by a proposed development. If a survey has not already been undertaken to determine the potential for bats on site and/or the presence of bats, the planning authority should request that the developers commission an appropriate survey. PLEASE CONFIRM THIS HAS BEEN COMMISSIONED.

7. I object also on the grounds that I believe the proposed demolition and development will have an impact on the habitat and wildlife in my area, in particular birds. When I sit in my neighbouring property I can hear a wide range of birdsong from roosting birds in the hedges on the site. I also feel that the development could be made more sympathetic to the local environment, enhancing opportunities for biodiversity. The proposal does not include retention of existing wildlife features on the site such as the hedgerows, nor do the proposals use native plants and trees in any landscaping designs. The planning application omits to mention the existing plants and trees and hedgerows on site. PLEASE CAN I HAVE SIGHT OF ANY TREE SURVEY CARRIED OUT AS PART OF THIS APPLICATION

I am objecting to this development as particular areas of concern for me are, in summary;

i) The proposed development is not in keeping with the surroundings and I am concerned about the proposed properties overlooking my own front rooms, in particular those on the proposed first floor and loft, overlooking into our children's bedrooms, and that they will overlook other neighbouring properties. There are 5 ground floor and 5 first floor windows proposed, as well as 5 loft windows.

ii) further compromising limited parking spaces. 8 apartments likely to bring at least 28-56 extra vehicles, plus their visitors. The current property has parking onsite for 3+ cars

iii) increase of additional vehicles would have a limiting affect on all blue badge or disabled/ mobility impaired visitors if spaces taken up by new residents

iv) I cannot see from the plans that there is adequate storage on site for the rubbish bins each household has. This would be a huge increase particularly on the day each week that the bins are collected. No other households on Park Road have to use the pavement, but I fear that for the houses for this proposed development they would, which would create a serious hazard for pavement users, particularly those in wheelchairs, mobility scooters and pushchairs/prams.

v) animal habitat, especially bats which I see each summer evening at dusk (as recently as March-April 2020) in my own neighbouring garden. We have previously emailed the planning officer as we have a short audio video to illustrate the birdsong from the hedgerow on the site. I wish this to be considered and viewed as part of the objection to this planning application

Comments: 20/03557/FUL

Repeating below my objections made in November 2020, which on consideration of the new plans, seem to be in no way altered. All I can see is one window being moved.

I object to the proposed demolition of existing dwelling and erection of building containing 8 apartments (2 one bedroom flats and 6 two bedroom flats) (amended scheme) on the site of one property.

On the date I am submitting this I can see that 2 consultees have commented but their comments are not visible to me.

I do not believe that the site is capable of accommodating 8 units and I believe that it is a clear case of over development.

More details of the objections:

1. I object to the proposed demolition and construction of 8 new dwellings (to house up to 28 people in place of one residential bungalow) as it would not be in keeping with the style of the existing properties on Park Road. Park Road is mainly made up of 1930s housing, and bungalows, not a modern building as proposed. Consideration needs to be given to the transition from bungalow dwellings on that side of the road and I am not sure that the height and scale of the proposed building provides an appropriate transition between the adjacent bungalows and those existing homes in Charles Street.

2. I object to the proposed construction as I would lose privacy as my rooms facing Park Road are not currently directly overlooked and there would be significant overlooking from the proposed development of 5 ground floor and 5 first floor windows proposed, as well as 5 loft windows. These would directly overlook our living rooms and, of more

concern, into our first floor children's bedrooms.

3. I object to the proposed planning on the grounds of increased traffic and parking issues as there is total lack of provision for parking on the proposed site. There are already limited permit parking spaces that would be under increased demand from the residents and visitors to the proposed development. The 8 new properties do not have any parking onsite whereas the existing dwelling has its own contained parking for 3+ cars. There is no provision for 28-56 extra cars plus their guests assuming 1 car per resident. The local council parking sites are also paid for parking and I am not sure that they would have room for those residents, nor that those residents would pay to park. Existing residents of flats on Charles Street, already use the limited permit spaces on Park Road, which are at capacity.

4. I object to the proposed development as it is proposed to replace a bungalow with 8 dwellings, increasing the population at least 8-fold and there will be increased noise and disturbance from those new residents.

5. I cannot see from the plans that there is adequate storage on site for the rubbish bins each household has. The plans only include a very small space for 'bin store' which I fear would be wholly inadequate for the 28+ residents. Bins for an additional 8 households would be a huge increase particularly on the day each week that the bins are collected, double on the days when Green and Blue bins are collected. No other households on Park Road have to use the pavement for their bins, but I fear that for the houses for this proposed development they would, which would create a serious hazard for pavement users, particularly those in wheelchairs, mobility scooters and pushchairs/prams.

6. An important ground for objection is that bats and other wildlife including nesting birds will be affected by this proposed development. I know that there are a number of bats in this area, I have seen bats flying around the eaves of these neighbouring properties at dusk and counted at least 20-30 sightings over the summers around 8/9pm every year. I am concerned that the proposed development will affect their roosts and also their commute to their roosts as the proposed development will not only demolish the building but also the trees on the roadside, which are in the line of travel of the bats.

My understanding is that the planning authority has a legal obligation to consider whether bats are likely to be affected by a proposed development.

I have seen that the Ecological survey 26.10.20, and the Council should ensure that the required further surveys are undertaken before granting planning permission. The Council should ensure that the recommendations of the ecological report are completed and monitored by the Council to ensure that the wildlife is respected and preserved.

- 1.4 "A small concentration of Pipistrelle bat droppings was found at the north-western gable end of the roof space, confirming the



presence of roosting bats. Hanging tiles at both gable end exteriors could also be used by roosting bats."

This report goes on to suggest at 1.5 "Further emergence surveys are required to classify the roost, determine if other roosting bats are present and support the application for a protected species licence to allow the demolition of the building legally."

- 6.5"... a set of emergence surveys are required during the bat activity season, which runs from May to September, to classify the roost, determine if other species of roosting bat are present and support a licence application to allow the demolition of the building within the current legal framework."

- 6.6 "In addition, as bats are present the three tests' required for a European Protected Licence must be satisfied "

- 7.1 "Two dusk and a dawn survey are required to classify the roost and support a licence application. These will be carried out during the active season of May to September, with at least one within the peak period of mid-May to August inclusive, but spread out to get the best picture of bat activity on the site. "

I note that at 2.4 (my emphasis) " The objective was to support a successful application for planning permission whilst maintaining the conservation status of bats and other wildlife within the local area "

I am not clear, from viewing the plans, that the plans include access points such as integrated bat boxes, permanent or temporary as required:

- 6.12 "As bats are roosting in the building access points will be reinstated by building-in integrated bat boxes at the northern and southern gables to provide roosting opportunities in a similar location to present. 6.13 In addition, the temporary bat boxes used in the working method statement and the ecological supervision will prevent detrimental effects occurring to individuals or the local population in the short-term, whilst retention of the bat boxes after the works have been completed will enhance the roosting potential in the area."

7. I object also on the grounds that I believe the proposed demolition and development will have an impact on the habitat and wildlife in my area, in particular birds. When I sit in my neighbouring property I can hear a wide range of birdsong from roosting birds in the hedges on the site. I also feel that the development could be made more sympathetic to the local environment, enhancing opportunities for biodiversity. The proposal does not include retention of existing wildlife features on the site such as the hedgerows, nor do the proposals use adequate native plants and trees in any landscaping designs. The planning application omits to mention the existing plants and trees and hedgerows on site.

The ecological report recommends:

- 6.15/6.16 "If works to the hedges, trees or shrubs is to be undertaken then a working method statement to avoid disturbance to nesting birds

	<p>should be followed."</p> <p>- 7.2 "Any tree or shrub removal will be undertaken using methods to avoid disturbance to nesting birds. Work will ideally take place outside the nesting bird season, which runs from March to August, to avoid disturbing nesting birds.7.3 If this is not possible an experienced ecologist will check the shrubs to be removed to search for birds' nests. If an active nest is found, it and 5m of habitat around it will remain undisturbed until the birds have fledged, before the nest can be removed. If no nests are identified, work can continue unhindered"</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>I am objecting to this development as particular areas of concern for me are, in summary;</p> <p>i) The proposed development is not in keeping with the surroundings. It is a clear case of overdevelopment on the plot, and would be overbearingly large in scale. I am concerned about the proposed properties overlooking my own front rooms, in particular those on the proposed first floor and loft, overlooking into our children's bedrooms, and that they will overlook other neighbouring properties.</p> <p>ii) further compromising limited permit parking spaces. 8 apartments likely to bring at least 28-56 extra vehicles, plus their visitors. The current property has parking onsite for 3+ cars for one household</p> <p>iii) increase of additional vehicles would have a limiting effect on all blue badge or disabled/ mobility impaired visitors if spaces taken up by new residents</p> <p>iv) I cannot see from the plans that there is adequate storage on site for the rubbish bins each unit has. This would be a huge increase particularly on the day each week that the bins are collected. No other households on Park Road have to use the pavement, but I fear that on this proposed development they would, which would create a serious hazard for pavement users, particularly those in wheelchairs, mobility scooters and pushchairs/prams.</p> <p>v) Animal habitat, especially bats which I see each summer evening at dusk (as recently as Summer 2020 and Summer 2021) in my own neighbouring garden.</p>
6 Charles Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development too high</li> <li>- General dislike of proposal</li> <li>- Inadequate access</li> <li>- Inadequate parking provision</li> <li>- Increase in traffic</li> <li>- Increase of pollution</li> <li>- Loss of parking</li> <li>- Loss of privacy</li> <li>- Out of keeping with character of area</li> <li>- Over development</li> </ul> <p>As well as the items listed above, our main concern for this new</p>

	<p>development is the pressure on local parking. Many existing households do not have off road parking, but do have two to three cars/vans per household. Some are business vehicles necessary for work, others are private - meaning that some homeowners are already currently forced to park an inordinate distance from their homes. As this new development supports a minimum of 8 but up to 28 people - realistically parking will need to be found for an extra 8 to 28 vehicles. With the street already struggling to cope with parking spaces, any future development must cater for the parking needs of new residents and consider the impact on existing residents.</p> <p>The new property, which accommodates potentially up to 28 people, will also overlook our bedroom window, which impacts on our privacy.</p> <p>Another concern is why the proposals are being submitted for the third time with just one window change but no consideration of other past comments from local residents eg parking taken into account.</p> <p>Also to date (13/07/21) I have not been formally notified by DBC of this planning application and yet the deadline for submissions is 22 July. We are planning a week's holiday imminently and if neighbours had not informed us about this situation, we could have easily missed the opportunity to object. DBC should give residents at least 3 weeks notification to ensure local residents have a chance to share their concerns.</p>
7 Charles Street	<p><u>Original Plans</u></p> <p>The surrounding area is residential comprising a mix of mainly 2 storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. We consider that the scale, density, height and massing of the proposed development is out of character with the adjoining surrounding residential development which is generally low density along Charles street and surrounding properties on Park Road.</p> <p>We consider that the density of the scheme, will adversely affect the amenity and existing character of the area and fails to satisfy the design criteria set out in policy CS12 of the core strategy.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that the provision of 8 apartments to replace a single residential dwelling. Constitutes over development of the site and incongruous to the surrounding area. The proposed development does not provide any provision for car parking or secure cycle storage. It is understood that the maximum car parking should be provided at a ratio of 1 space per 1 or 2 bed property to comply with the councils parking standards and that the lack of any provision will provide additional parking stress on the local highway network. The lack of secure cycle area does not comply with the councils policies which is contrary to the provisions of the development plan and policy CS8. The overall application submission is lacking in information. In particular a design and Access statement has not been submitted with the application to consider its potential impact on overlooking or loss of sunlight and daylight to surrounding residential properties. In addition there are no details provided regarding the existing trees along the boundary of the application site or how the amenity space</p>

	<p>provided complies with the development plan. In light of the above we respectfully request that the above planning application is refused on the grounds that it is contrary to polices CS12 and CS8 of the adopted core strategy.</p> <p><u>Amend Plans</u></p> <p>We object to this planning application. On the grounds that it is an over development of the site also not in keeping with the dwellings around it.</p> <p>Loss of light The building will block light into my living room, and bedroom making them much darker.</p> <p>Impact on parking The current occupiers of the plot, regularly park 3-4 cars on their driveway which will be taken away. To say that treble the occupancy will not have cars, is ridiculous. With two schools nearby and Charles street being a rat run. With a lot of HGV vehicles using it. With cars being parked either side making finding a space to park safely hard. Without adding extra cars.</p>
8a Charles Street	<p>We object to the proposed demolition and development of 2 one bed apartments and 6 two bed apartments.</p> <p>We reside directly opposite the site of the proposed development and have noted that the developer has simply resubmitted a previously withdrawn application. It was withdrawn due to the council's concerns that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It is disappointing that the developer has ignored said advice and opinions and still proposes 8 flats which is, in our opinion, a significant overdevelopment for such a small plot of land. As such, our previously submitted objections from the previous application remain the same and should be taken into account for this application.</p> <p>1. In our opinion we feel that it is inappropriate to put 8 units on a plot this size. Potentially, there could be up to 28 people staying in the new development (based on 2 people per bedroom) which would be an unacceptable increase in noise disturbance from the new residents. Clearly, the developer is trying to maximise his profits rather than develop the local community. This statement is backed up by the fact that he has applied with almost the exact same application as his last submission. This shows a lack of interest in our concerns about the overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>2. We object to the proposed development due to increased traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>Nowhere on the proposed plans is there any kind of on-site parking allocation. Where would these new residents leave their cars? There are already two other multi-residential properties on Charles street and potentially one more on Park road/Vicarage Close. Together these clusters of new residents would swamp the local area with vehicles and people.</p>

	<p>The proposed properties are targeting professionals and families which normally have more than one car per household which would only add to the already stretched parking allowance in the local area. Even if there was something in place to prevent the residents of the new development from gaining residents parking permits, we feel this would simply encourage illegal parking which the councils' limited resources would not be able to prevent.</p> <p>3. This site has hundreds of children walking past each day on their way to the 2 large local schools, as well as the nursery, and the size of the development would only increase the volume of traffic, adding a significant safety hazard to those pedestrians.</p> <p>4. We object to the planned development due to its design layout. The developer has maximised the development footprint to such an extent that at least 3 out of the 4 proposed properties will overlook and reduce the privacy of several surrounding properties including our own. At least the top two floors of the proposed development would look directly into our property including the bedrooms of our children as well as our own.</p> <p>5. Another objection is due to the size and overdevelopment of the proposed site we feel our right of light would be compromised and our privacy reduced to an unacceptable level.</p> <p>6. We object to the proposal due to the density of the site. Too much green space would be lost including nesting bats and birds from the hedgerow on Park Road. From what I could gather, I believe a survey has been carried out which states the need for further investigation into whether nesting bats are present between the months of May-September. If the property is demolished before such time then clearly the necessary legal consideration will have been neglected by the planning authority.</p> <p>7. Finally, we do not feel that the proposed development would be in keeping with the existing housing on Charles street and Park Road. Generally the houses in the area are aged between 1930-1950 style and an oversized block of modern flats would ruin the look and feel of the surrounding residential area.</p>
15 Charles Street	<p>Our objections are largely the same as last time (April 2020) because the plans haven't really substantially changed.</p> <p>Loss of privacy -----</p> <p>Our upstairs bathroom window currently opens slightly with a view to far away Nexus house on Charles St and open sky. With the new development we will have people looking straight into the room from an almost equal level second floor. There is a mere 1.80m distance between the walls, i.e. only just out of reach for us to shake hands from window to window with the new neighbours.</p> <p>The plans for the "tree screening" along our garden are unclear. It would appear that if those trees will have a height and density comparable to the current hedge that there won't be any negative</p>

impact on our garden's privacy but because the plans are not specific enough so we have to fear that people from the second floor will now have a direct view into our patio and garden area.

#### Loss of light

Loss of light on our western side windows (the ones facing the new development):

a) The downstairs cloakroom window will be completely shaded. It will lose most of the incoming light due to the new building being a mere 1.8m away and towering to the height of the ridge of our roof all the length to the front of the building.

b) The windows in the staircase and the upstairs bathroom will be significantly darkened due to facing a massive wall just a few metres away.

It is worth noting that the developer of the new property next to 16 Charles Street (16 Charles Street is a mirror image of our property, having the same set of windows facing east where ours face west) had in their initial plan similarly obstruct these windows and had to change their design to something not obstructing them before getting their plans approved.

#### Unacceptably high density / environmental concerns

The planned design is too dense with a drastic reduction of current green space.

a) The high hedges and trees (all to be removed) are used by lots of birds for nesting, and

b) attract a large amount of insects during spring and summer which feed the birds and the bats around here.

c) The garden is home to hedgehogs.

All of these will be lost and apparently replaced with a big building, some dead green space and a but of unspecified "tree screening".

We refer you to the detailed objections from 8A Charles Street and 4 Park Road about this which we fully agree with and support.

#### Out of character development

Every property around here has some garden space. The proposed development is totally out of character with its modicum of "landscaped amenity space" and a couple of unspecified trees. Those new trees are no substitute for flower beds, shrubs, hedges and established trees that are normal in this area.

While there is no consistent size of building on Charles Street and Park Road, properties are single-family properties with the few exceptions being some historical buildings. Whenever these were redeveloped the developer kept the original building and worked with that substance like e.g. happened in Nexus House.

	<p>We refer you to the more detailed objections from 83 Heath Lane which we agree with and fully support.</p> <p>Impact on parking -----</p> <p>The current occupiers of the plot are regularly parking 3-4 cars on the driveway without even using the garage. All of this will be lost, replaced with nothing except higher demand for parking.</p> <p>The occupancy of the plot will at least double if not treble. The idea that no parking at all is to be provided for these new properties is unbelievable to anybody around here who experiences the everyday struggle of people trying to park their car in a safe way.</p> <p>In fact even the developer clearly does not believe in non-car usage since they provide but a tiny cycle storage which seems to cover maybe 3 bicycles where a need for at minimum of 14 (2 per double bedroom and 1 per single bedroom apartment) seems appropriate.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the council has only recently revisited the residents parking permit pricing. From the pricing structure it is clear that the council considers one car per property a necessity and two or even three cars per property if not desirable then at least normal and acceptable. This is contradicting the pie-in-sky thinking that residents of newly developed properties will somehow require no cars.</p> <p>In summary, the high density development with lack of green space is out of character with surrounding and will severely impact the privacy of our home as well as the lighting on our property. Since the only difference is the removal of one window which would have been overlooking our bathroom window our objections from last year remain except for the first paragraph in "Loss of privacy".</p> <p>It is really a shame that given all the feedback and long time since that feedback was given the developer could not be bothered to give additional details about the plans. E.g. the question about bicycle parking, the intended tree screening etc. One has to assume this is intentional to not be pinned down to specifics and that indeed the worst solution that is still acceptable to the planning department is envisaged</p>
83 Heath Lane	<p>Scale and Character of Development</p> <p>The surrounding area is residential comprising a mix of mainly 2 storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. We consider that the scale, density, height and massing of the proposed development is out of character with the adjoining surrounding residential development which is generally low density along Park Road and the surrounding properties on Charles Street.</p> <p>We consider that the density of the scheme will adversely affect the amenity and existing character of the surrounding area and fails to satisfy the design criteria set out in Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy. We are of the opinion that the provision of 8 apartments to replace a single residential dwellings constitutes over development of the site</p>

	<p>and incongruous to the surrounding area.</p> <p>Impact on Highway Safety</p> <p>The proposed development does not provide any provision for car parking or secure cycle storage. It is understood that maximum car parking should be provided at a ratio of 1 space per 1 or 2 bed property to comply with the Councils parking standards and that the lack of any provision will provide additional parking stress on the local highway network. The lack of secure cycle does not comply with the Councils policies and objectives to deliver sustainable development which is contrary to the provisions of the development plan and Policy CS8.</p> <p>Additional comments</p> <p>The overall application submission is lacking in information. In particular a Design and Access Statement has not been submitted with the application to consider its potential impact on overlooking or loss of sunlight and daylight to surrounding residential properties. In addition there are no details provided regarding the existing trees along the boundary of the application site or how the amenity space provided complies with the development plan. This is a massive over development of an existing one off property and the whole development has no breathing space.</p> <p>In light of the above we respectfully request that the above planning application is refused on the grounds that it is contrary to Policies CS12 and CS8 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>
2 Park Road	<p>We object to the proposed development for the following reasons.</p> <p>No provision for parking has been made on the site - at present, at least four vehicles can be parked on the bungalow's drive. Eight units of accommodation are planned - despite this being a location close to the town centre, the likelihood of every unit of accommodation requiring at least one car parking space (probably more) is high. Most existing properties in the area have two cars and pressure on the CPZ spaces is already intense. This pressure has already been exacerbated by the redevelopment of the former hotel in Charles Street.</p> <p>Eight units of accommodation on such a compact site will introduce significant parking issues. There will inevitably be an associated increase in pollution and traffic on an already busy junction, close to two schools.</p> <p>Eight units of accommodation on such a compact site will also inevitably lead to an increase in noise pollution. Despite being an urban road, Park Road is generally quiet because each existing property is set back from its neighbours. This development is not in keeping with any other property in the vicinity - even the former hotel and 8 Charles Street are / were redevelopments of existing properties in keeping with the area and suitable for the numbers of accommodation units. The access to properties directly off Park Road</p>



	<p>is inconsistent with the rest of the properties on the street, certainly not in keeping. This proposed development is simply cramming as many units on to a site that is not suitable and not in keeping with the area.</p> <p>The current bungalow is in keeping with the other houses in Park Road. The road contains a mix of 1930's semi-detached properties and bungalows of a chalet-type design, of which 1 Park Road is one. The proposed development is not in keeping with the rest of the road and will stand out like a sore thumb - it is too large for the road, too high and not in keeping with the character of the area.</p> <p>The current property is very effectively screened by mature planting and trees. The proposed development, by squeezing eight units of accommodation into such a small site, removes all of that softer feel replacing vegetation with hard development, which is again not in keeping with the neighbourhood.</p> <p>We also have the pleasure of bats flying around our front garden and believe they are nesting in the existing planting. That planting is certainly home to a number of birds, which bring a country-feel to an otherwise urban environment.</p> <p>We are concerned that we will have direct line of sight from our property, potentially the front rooms but certainly the front and loft bedrooms, into the redeveloped property. That is not the case at present, not least as the existing bungalow is built at an angle to prevent such oversight.</p> <p>We also have concerns that the upper rooms in the proposed development will have direct line of sight into our front room and office.</p> <p>We are disappointed that the revised plans do nothing to address the objections previously made. Those objections look to have been simply disregarded. There is universal objection to this development as it is simply not in keeping with the area and will have a significantly negative effect in respect of the keeping of the area, the ecology and the traffic, in an area that is already busy particularly at school opening and closing times.</p>
2A Park Road	<p>In reference to new planning application 1 Park Road dated 8th July 2021.</p> <p>We reside at 2A Park Road which is located immediately opposite the application site in respect of the above property and are writing to formally object to the planning application. We note that this is a resubmission of a previous application that was withdrawn due to the Council's concerns that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It is very disappointing that the revised scheme still proposes 8 flats which in our opinion is a significant overdevelopment of a small plot of land. As such the material planning considerations we summarised from the previous application remain the same which should be taken into account in determining the above planning application.</p>

	<p>Scale and Character of Development</p> <p>The surrounding area is residential comprising a mix of mainly 2 storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. We consider that the scale, density, height and massing of the proposed development is out of character with the adjoining surrounding residential development which is generally low density along Park Road and the surrounding properties on Charles Street.</p> <p>We consider that the density of the scheme will adversely affect the amenity and existing character of the surrounding area and fails to satisfy the design criteria set out in Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy. We are of the opinion that the provision of 8 apartments to replace a single residential dwellings constitutes over development of the site and incongruous to the surrounding area.</p> <p>Impact on Highway Safety</p> <p>The proposed development does not provide any provision for car parking or secure cycle storage. It is understood that maximum car parking should be provided at a ratio of 1 space per 1 or 2 bed property to comply with the Councils parking standards and that the lack of any provision will provide additional parking stress on the local highway network. The lack of secure cycle does not comply with the Councils policies and objectives to deliver sustainable development which is contrary to the provisions of the development plan and Policy CS8.</p> <p>Additional comments</p> <p>The overall application submission is lacking in information. In particular a Design and Access Statement has not been submitted with the application to consider its potential impact on overlooking or loss of sunlight and daylight to surrounding residential properties. In addition there are no details provided regarding the existing trees along the boundary of the application site or how the amenity space provided complies with the development plan.</p> <p>In light of the above we respectfully request that the above planning application is refused on the grounds that it is contrary to Policies CS12 and CS8 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>
8 Park Road	<p>Again, overdeveloped for the size of plot, interruption and risk to known wildlife roosts, bats in particular, and many small bird colonies. inadequate parking, barely any difference to last proposal that was withdrawn.. Out of character with the houses in the immediate vicinity and yet another multiple household occupancy building on what was a single property sized plot,</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>As there appears to be only a change to a window, and all previous objections ignored by the proposer, I submit my original objections, but with increased frustration.</p>

	<p>With the lack of planting/garden, not only is it out of keeping, but increased excess water run off risk. There is already a problem drain at the bottom of Charles street into the Cotterrells which regularly floods over, and this will increase the problem.</p> <p>Clearly no changed provision for mature colonies of birds and bats that have been mentioned in many objections, or adequate planting</p> <p>Parking, will increase pressure to current residents by adding a far too overdeveloped plan to what is currently a single family home which has only recently had a change of tenant to a family with school age children who attend the local school.</p> <p>Hazardous area to squeeze further vehicle movement into, on a busy corner between schools and nurseries.</p> <p>Previous comments below, as nothing in the revised plan has changed any of these elements... and I note that the first application was withdrawn, then another but very similar one was made, and now this very minor change. Does the proposer/developer not bother to look at the objections, or feel that the lack of information they provide is not important? Comments copied below.</p> <p>Again, overdeveloped for the size of plot, interruption and risk to known wildlife roosts, bats in particular, and many small bird colonies. inadequate parking, barely any difference to last proposal that was withdrawn.. Out of character with the houses in the immediate vicinity and yet another multiple household occupancy building on what was a single property sized.</p>
10 Park Road	<p>I object to this proposed development as it will bring no benefit to the area other than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create more parking issues than we already have. No parking provisions have been made within the development.</li> <li>- Increase traffic congestion along Charles Street and Park Road both of which are extremely busy due to their close proximity to two schools on Heath Lane.</li> <li>- be completely out of character of the other semi-detached, detached and terraced houses on the street leading to an over development of the area.</li> </ul> <p>I fail to understand how changing just a window since the original application was submitted will bring about any positive changes to all the negative environmental, ecological and social factors the public have already raised objections to.</p>
15 Park Road	<p>I object to this application because:</p> <p>a) In general the development is out of keeping with the character of the area which has detached and semi-detached family homes. b) The application is contrary to the Dacorum Council's Local Plans.</p>

Context and development of street and area in last few years but still mainly detached family homes.

The proposal is on the corner of Park Rd. and Charles St. Over the last 10 years or so a number of flats and a small house (on the site of a garage) have been developed in Charles St. For example a large house has been turned into multiple flats, a hotel has been converted into flats, a house has been turned into 2 flats and its garage turned into a tiny one roomed 'house'. These developments have changed the character of the street, added to the parking problems, added to environmental problems

Demolition of a good quality property. Out of keeping with the character of the area

The application wants to destroy a good quality existing home. There is nothing wrong with it and it is very desirable. The previous developments over the last 10 years were changes to the existing structures - apart from the garage which was knocked down and replaced with a similar sized one roomed 'house'. This development knocks down a good quality detached family home and builds several flats in its place. That is out of keeping with character of the area.

Family Home Character of area.

The area needs larger homes for families to move into. These larger family homes are in keeping with this area. The flat developments in the area have provided smaller homes and flats for single people and couples without children.

Contrary to local plan e.g. CS11, CS8 etc.

This development on the site of good quality detached home adds to environmental problems and to traffic. All contrary to the Local Plan - amongst them I think CS11, CS8 and others.

Nursery and School children

Both Charles St. and Park Road are used by nursery, primary and secondary school children getting up to their schools at the top of Charles St. on Heath Lane. The development adds to the congestion and reduces parking. It is of a safety concern to children getting to school.

Parking.

The development doesn't have enough parking and so many of the residents, their friends, their visitors, their family will park on the street. This adds to the congestion in the area. The existing off road parking will be lost.

Environment

There is a loss of good sized garden and its trees which add to the

	<p>open space and also has an effect on the environment e.g. absorbs rainfall and helps with drainage.</p> <p>Human Rights Act</p> <p>There has been no consideration of the Human Rights Act with the rights to privacy and family life. The development will infringe local residents privacy as well as their right to a family life.</p> <p>Bats and Wildlife</p> <p>There are concerns over the Bats in the area - this has not sufficiently been taken into account by the proposal and development. There is other wildlife in the area that will be affected or destroyed by this development.</p> <p>Temporary nuisance of building if proposal granted - curbs needed on building hours.</p> <p>If the application is approved, the council should consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation and other restrictions that might make the duration of the works more bearable. The proposed site of development is very small and contained, with no road frontage, so we would ask that consideration be made about how and where construction vehicles and staff would gain access to the site for unloading and parking without causing a highway hazard or inconveniencing neighbours as well as school children.</p> <p>Building and development should not take place during the hours when children are going to and from school.</p> <p>Privacy</p> <p>People will lose their privacy as they will be over looked - this applies not just to immediate neighbours but to others in the street.</p> <p>Increased noise because of the nature of the hill and area</p> <p>There will be added noise to the area after the development - the area echos and funnels noise because it is on the hill.</p>
17 Park Road	<p>We object to the proposed development of the 1 Park Road site for the following reasons:</p> <p>1/ Over development of the site; a fairly small detached residence with small 'wrapped round garden' which, up till recently was well maintained! surely cannot be replaced by 2 x 1 bedroom flats and 6 x 2 bedroom flats.</p> <p>2/ Parking in the area is already stretched to the limit. Where are all the extra cars going to be parked? We notice that there is no provision on the site.</p> <p>3/ The sympathetic development of this area of mainly semi/terraced and mixed detached properties seems to have been completely side-</p>

	<p>stepped in view of getting as much into a small space as possible.</p> <p>4/ The junction of Park Road and Charles Street (a narrow road) is a congestion point for traffic e.g. 2 schools and access roads.</p>
18 Park Road	<p>I object to this proposal on the grounds of over development of the site, not in keeping with the area and no provision for car parking. Potential residents of the proposed units will of course have cars and this will affect an already busy and dangerous corner. A development of 2 houses on the site I could understand but this is way over the top in my opinion.</p>
19 Park Road	<p>We live in Park Road. We are writing to formally object to this planning application. It is completely unsuitable for this corner plot on a junction with Charles Street. The parking around this area is already a problem without adding to it by this overdevelopment of the site with NO parking whatsoever. This is a busy road with all of the children attending the local schools using this road to get to/from their schools, as well as parents parking/dropping off their children. It also would cause a problem for emergency vehicles trying to get up/down the road at times, too.</p> <p>This area is mainly one and two storey dwellings. The height of this development is ludicrous and completely out of character for this area. Most of the houses have front and back gardens and parking.</p> <p>There would be no gardens or frontage, what about the local wildlife, you should be encouraging gardens not doing away with them! There will be an impact on Highway safety as there is no parking provided for and local people who already park there will have an added problem of not being able to park in their own road. If it is said in the application that the people who will reside in these flats will not own or have use of a car, then presumably you will be putting a Covenant on this to say exactly that?</p> <p>In light of the above we respectfully request that the above planning application is refused as it is contrary to Policies CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>
37 Park Road	<p>I have read the other comments left by local residents and concerned parties, and agree with all objections. There are two schools and 2 nursery schools within 100m of this proposed site, with no parking provisions being made. This is and will be a danger to children and parents using this route daily to walk their children to these locations. The parking pressures within this zone are already at their maximum with residents often being unable to park whilst having to pay a yearly fee for the luxury of further pressures being placed on this area. There simply is not enough space to accommodate another potential 10+ vehicles that this proposal would bring. This proposal is also not in keeping with the local aesthetics of the area, or the environment, including a likely rise in pollution levels near to 4 locations where children attend.</p>
59 Park Road	<p>In our opinion this would be an overdevelopment and out of keeping</p>

	<p>with the area, which is largely comprised of detached and semi-detached properties with outdoor spaces such as gardens and driveways.</p> <p>A lack of parking would add to existing pressures on the local area, with parking already being an issue. With two schools situated nearby, this could also add to concerns about the potential for road traffic issues.</p>
1 Vicarage Close	<p>I am writing to object to the proposal at 1 Park Road, Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>This scheme is yet another overdevelopment for a small plot in this area, this is clear to see by the lack of parking, the 8 flats have been given ZERO parking provision, which is ludicrous for a parking controlled zone just outside the town centre, 8 flats has the potential to add 16 vehicles to an already busy parking zone. The local plan sets out that for the dwellings proposed there must be a minimum of 9 spaces for zone 3 which we are in, I understand there's an argument that it could be classed as zone 2 due to its proximity to the town centre, even if this is the case the minimum requirement is 6 spaces, still a massive shortfall on the requirements set out in the plan.</p> <p>The scale and density of the build is overbearing and cramped on a small plot, this will have an adverse affect on neighbouring properties especially 15 Charles street.</p> <p>These type of overdevelopments are becoming more frequent, I think if DBC planning allow these to go ahead it will set a precedent and allow it to snowball out of control, what is very much a set-back urban area will be allowed to become an overdeveloped extension of the town centre.</p> <p>These are only a couple of examples of the shortfalls and concerns that have been disregarded in the plans I understand that there is a demand for homes in the area but this development needs to be rejected in favour of something that is more suitable for the site.</p>
2 Vicarage Close	<p>As the owners of 2 Vicarage Close, located on the corner of Park Road and cul-de-sac Vicarage Close, we are near to the proposed 8 flat development site of 1 Park Road and are therefore writing to formally object to the planning application which we feel is completely unsuitable for a plot on the corner of Park Road and Charles Street.</p> <p>This change of use will cause extra additional strain on parking and infrastructure on 2 already busy roads. This is contrary to the provisions of the development plan and Policy CS8 and CS9.</p> <p>This area of Boxmoor has an individual character which is a peaceful residential area with an extremely good community spirit with a mixture of detached, semi-detached and town houses. We feel that the rapid extension of flats in the town centre is now being extended into an over growing urban centre encroaching into deeper Boxmoor. This area should remain separate to the town centre itself.</p>

	<p>The proposed development shows no parking facility: this can only add to parking problems and at busy times 3 educational establishments where children are either walking or being dropped off will cause additional hazards.</p> <p>The character, scale, density, height of the proposed development is not in character with the ethos of surrounding properties which have spacious front gardens and drives set back from the road. Therefore we consider the scheme fails to satisfy the design criteria set out in policy CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the above planning application is refused in that it is contrary to Policies CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11, CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>
3 Vicarage Close	<p>I write this objection on behalf of 3 Vicarage Close.</p> <p>I was informed of this proposed application and giggled, believing it was April Fools day. However a glance at the calendar soon turned the laughter to one of nervousness. Why nervous? Well looking at the plans, we again appear to be fighting as a collective against the greed of a few.</p> <p>Although not a direct neighbour (in the sense of the term), we feel that the outcome of this will greatly influence others who hold similar objectives.</p> <p>The area around Boxmoor is one of character, displaying historically styled houses with more modern post war architecture. It is this style that provides Boxmoor with its uniqueness and makes it a pleasure to call home. Although it has seen it's fair share of development over the years, these have improved the area rather than detract. However, the scale of such a development in this area is astonishing and will be at odds to the overall ambience of Boxmoor.</p> <p>Our fear is that if this is given the green light, it will act as a catalyst for future developments in a similar vein to this. The question then asked is, where does it stop?</p> <p>Aside from the above, the application doesn't appear to factor in the increase in vehicular traffic born out of these 8 residences which in turn could cause issues during school times, parking in an area already tight for space (average U.K. household has 1.21 vehicles according to nibblefins.co.uk - which on this data would bring an additional 10 cars to the area). This in turn has an impact on the local pollution levels.</p> <p>We could go on and on however in the end of the day the key question that has to be asked is, is this justified? We would say no. Our fear is the domino effect this could cause if successful. What is to say that other like minded individuals...driven by monetary greed...will not submit their own plans to demolish their house and squeeze several flats on a relatively small piece of land.</p> <p>The only people to benefit from these types of planning applications</p>



	<p>are the applicants themselves. They hold no ounce of empathy as to what such a development will have on the neighbourhood. Why should they, they will have moved away from the area having milked it for all its worth. However, the impact felt by the people left behind and having to live in the shadow of this and other developments will be felt for years to come.</p> <p>We therefore submit this comment to voice our objection to this planned development.</p>
4 Vicarage Close	<p>We reside at 4 Vicarage Close, in a cul-de-sac that is very closely located to the proposed 8 flat development site on 1 Park Road.</p> <p>In respect of the above development we are writing to formally object to the planning application.</p> <p>This development is completely unsuitable for the corner plot on 1 Park Road and will add much additional strain to parking and infrastructure on this already busy road.</p> <p>This area in Boxmoor is Zone K for parking and has individual character and charm. It is rapidly becoming an extension of the over growing urban centre, and should remain set-back and separate from the town itself.</p> <p>This development includes no parking and will add safety issues to a road on a hill that is used by many children and their parents several times a day as their main school walking route to and from town (for Hemel School, South Hill School and Health Lane Nursery).</p> <p>The material planning considerations which should be taken into account in determining the above planning application are summarised below:</p> <p><b>Scale and Character of Development</b></p> <p>The surrounding area is residential comprising a mix of mainly 2 storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings on Park Road.</p> <p>We consider that the scale, density, height and massing of the proposed development is out of character with the adjoining surrounding residential development which is generally low density with spacious full front gardens and private driveway parking that is back from the road.</p> <p>We consider that the density of the scheme will adversely affect the amenity of current dwelling.</p> <p>As a result, the above development fails to satisfy the design criteria set out in Policy CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p><b>Impact on Highway Safety</b></p> <p>The proposed development does not provide adequate provision for car parking adding additional parking stress on the local highway</p>

	<p>network.</p> <p>This would significantly reduce current and available residents parking.</p> <p>This is contrary to the provisions of the development plan and Policy CS8 and CS9.</p> <p>In light of the above we respectfully request that the above planning application is refused on the grounds that it is contrary to Policies CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>
<p>9 Vicarage Close</p>	<p>I live very close to the proposed development at 1 Park Road and want to object to the planning application.</p> <p>The parking in this area is already a problem and with no allocated parking for these new flats will add to the already overcrowded conditions causing a danger to pedestrians, and particularly the large number of school children and families who use this area, and put additional strain on parking for existing residents.</p> <p>I think this proposed development is inappropriate for this area, which is a quiet residential street and does not fit into the style of surrounding houses.</p>
<p>17 Vicarage Close</p>	<p>We are neighbours living in vicarage close, and believe the proposed development will have a negative effect on the local area. My main objections are that - This change of use will cause extra additional strain on parking and infrastructure on 2 already busy roads. This is contrary to the provisions of the development plan and Policy CS8 and CS9.</p> <p>The proposed development shows no parking facility: this can only add to parking problems and at busy times. The roads connecting this development are regularly used by local school children and parents dropping off. If this development is agreed, this will cause a danger to the local children.</p> <p>We consider the scheme fails to satisfy the design criteria set out in policy CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>We request that the above planning application is refused in that it is contrary to Policies CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11, CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>