

ITEM NUMBER: 5b

21/01870/FUL	Relocation of existing dilapidated drying shed and construction of 2no. two bedroom houses with parking, gardens and all ancillary works. The works also includes roadway improvements/ alterations to those approved under permission 4/02850/18/FUL	
Site Address:	Drying Shed Akeman Business Park Akeman Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AF	
Applicant/Agent:	Aurient Commercial	Mr Jonathan Tucker
Case Officer:	Colin Lecart	
Parish/Ward:	Tring Town Council	Tring West & Rural
Referral to Committee:	Objection received from Town Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be GRANTED.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 the principle of residential development on the site has been established through numerous historic prior approval consents and planning permissions. Furthermore, the Akeman Business Park is no longer saved as a General Employment Area under Policy 31 of the Local Plan (2004).

2.2 The development is considered acceptable with regards to the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area, its impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring property, and on Highway and Parking grounds. The primary, and sole issue relating to the refusal of planning application 20/00818/FUL has now been addressed through the proposal to relocate drying shed rather than demolish it. The conservation officer is satisfied with this approach and a condition will ensure that a scheme for the shed's dismantling, storage, repair and re-mantling is agreed in writing prior to the commencement of the development.

2.3 Due to this, the development is considered acceptable with regards to local and national policy and is therefore recommended for approval.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The former Akeman Street Business Park (ABP) features a wide range of buildings of various ages and designs and was a very long established industrial area within the core of the Tring Conservation Area, recognised as a designated General Employment Area(GEA).

3.2 It is located between Akeman Street, Langdon Street and Albert Street, served by a relatively wide one way access arrangement. Entry is from Akeman Street with exit onto Langdon Street. A Grade 2 listed building (Honours) adjoins the Akeman Street access.

3.3 ABP is subject to a range of recent decisions for its conversion/ redevelopment to residential, benefitting from 'permitted development' rights to enable conversion from employment to housing uses, with associated planning permissions.

3.4 The Yard's redevelopment is currently progressing in line with a variety of prior approval and full planning permissions on the wider site.

3.5 A predominantly open gable 5 bay timber frame asbestos roof barn is located to the south west of the Central Yard adjoining the rear gardens of dwellings in Langdon Street. The submitted

Heritage Statement confirms that the building is circa 1899-1924, explaining that it seems very likely that it was an open air drying store for timber serving the joinery works which were also based at the Akeman Business Park.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The application seeks permission for the relocation of existing dilapidated drying shed and construction of 2no. two bedroom houses with parking, gardens and all ancillary works. The works also include roadway improvements/ alterations to those approved under permission 4/02850/18/FUL.

4.2 It is noted that a previous application for a very similar proposal was refused under application 20/00818/FUL. An associated appeal to this decision was dismissed. However, it should be noted that the single reason for refusal was concerned with the proposed demolition of the drying shed, which was considered a non-designated heritage asset. The associated appeal was dismissed due to the proposed loss of a non-designated heritage asset and no other issues were of significant contention.

4.3 This application is essentially the same as the previously refused scheme in terms of the proposed dwellings, though some alterations to the access are proposed and it is proposed that the existing drying shed is dismantled and relocated to an existing parking area on site.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

19/02786/FUL - Demolition of existing dilapidated drying shed and construction of 2no. two bedroom houses with parking, gardens and all ancillary works- the works also includes roadway improvements/ alterations to those approved under permission 4/02850/18/FUL
WDN - 24th February 2020

19/02796/ROC - Variation of Condition 12 (Approved plans) attached to planning permission 4/01170/19/FUL (PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF SINGLE-STOREY REAR ADDITION. PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE OF YG20, YG21, YG22, YG23, YG27, YG28, YG29, YG30, YG31 FROM D2 TO C3 RESIDENTIAL TO FACILITATE THE PROVISION OF 4 X TWO-BEDROOM DWELLINGS WITH AMENITY SPACE AND ASSOCIATED PARKING)
GRA - 20th March 2020

19/02797/ROC - Variation of Condition 3 (Approved Plans/Materials) Attached to Planning Permission (Re-Elevation And Associated Operational Works To Buildings At Akeman Central Yard Comprising: Amendments To Existing Doors/windows And Replacement Doors/windows; Introduction Of New Doors/windows And Juliet Balconies; White Render Finish; Grey Door/window Frames, Fascias; Red Multi Brick Slip Finish And Detailing.)
GRA - 19th March 2020

19/02927/DRC - Details as required by conditions 4 - (Cycle storage), 5 -(Street signage), 6 - (Wall modification), 7 - (Existing access), 9 - (Bird and bat box's), 14 - (Exterior lighting) and 16 - (Acoustic Measures). Attached to planning permission 4/02850/18/FUL (Demolition of 13 buildings (part and full as appropriate) and operational works to 12 buildings. Construction of 4 dwellings and associated parking. Addition of two new walled enclosures to provide amenity space to two Buildings.)
GRA - 11th May 2020

19/02938/DRC - Details as Required by Condition 19 (Construction Traffic Management, Phasing and Health + Safety Plan) Attached to Planning Permission 4/02850/18/FUL (Demolition of 13

buildings (part and full as appropriate) and operational works to 12 buildings. Construction of 4 dwellings and associated parking. Addition of two new walled enclosures to provide amenity space to two Buildings.)

GRA - 13th January 2020

19/03242/DRC - Details as Required by Condition 2 (Rainwater Goods, Rooflights, Doors and Windows) Attached to Planning Permission 4/01162/19/ROC (Variation of Condition 3 (Materials and Design) Attached to Planning Permission 4/02850/18/FUL)

GRA - 19th March 2020

20/00379/DRC - Details required by condition 2 (materials), 8 (Part A Only:contaminated land) and 11 (construction traffic management plan)) attached to planning permission 4/01170/19/FUL - partial demolition of single-storey rear addition. proposed change of use of yg20, yg21, yg22, yg23, yg27, yg28, yg29, yg30, yg31 from d2 to c3 residential to facilitate the provision of 4 x two-bedroom dwellings with amenity space and associated parking.

GRA - 20th April 2020

20/00536/ROC - Variation of Condition 3 (approved plans) attached to planning permission 4/01163/19/FUL - Re-elevation and associated operational works to buildings at Akeman Central Yard comprising: amendments to existing doors/windows and replacement doors/windows; introduction of new doors/windows and juliet balconies; white render finish; grey door/window frames, fascias; red multi brick slip finish and detailing.

GRA - 7th May 2020

20/00818/FUL - Demolition of existing shed. Construction of two houses with parking, gardens and all ancillary works (includes roadway improvements/ alterations to those approved under permission 4/02850/18/FUL).

REF - 27th August 2020

21/03149/DRC - Details as required by condition 2 (materials) attached to planning permission 4/01163/19/FUL (Re-elevation and associated operational works to buildings at akeman central yard comprising: amendments to existing doors/windows and replacement doors/windows; introduction of new doors/windows and juliet balconies; white render finish; grey door/window).

GRA - 15th October 2021

21/03150/DRC - Details as required by condition 6 (cycle and refuse) attached to planning permission 4/03111/18/OPA (Proposed conversion of vacant office units to create 7 x residential dwelling houses with associated parking).

GRA - 20th October 2021

21/03151/DRC - Details required by conditions 4 (signage scheme), 5 (hard landscaping), 6 (access road) 7 (fire hydrants) and 10 (lighting design) relating to planning permission 4/01170/19/FUL - Partial demolition of single-storey rear addition. Proposed change of use of yg20, yg21, yg22, yg23, yg27, yg28, yg29, yg30, yg31 from d2 to c3 residential to facilitate the provision of 4 x two-bedroom dwellings with amenity space and associated parking.

GRA - 27th October 2021

21/03650/DRC - Details required by condition 2 (refuse and secure cycle storage) attached to Planning Permission 4/00553/18/LPA - Change of use from light industrial to residential creating 6 new dwellings with associated parking.

GRA - 8th October 2021

4/02154/19/FUL - Planning permission and conservation area consent for partial demolition to re-roof yg6.1-6.4 replacing existing profiled metal sheet with classic-coated copper standing seam roof and to include 3 no. Velux roof windows
GRA - 9th December 2019

4/01549/19/DRC - Details as required by conditions 2 (materials), 8 (fire hydrants), 10 (contamination), 12 (written scheme of investigation) and 19 (construction traffic management plan) attached to planning permission 4/02850/18/ful (demolition of 13 buildings (part and
GRA - 8th October 2019

4/01548/19/DRC - Details as required by condition 2 (materials) attached to planning permission 4/00146/18/ful (operational works to buildings at akeman business park comprising: amendments to existing windows and replacement windows; introduction of new windows and balco
GRA - 20th August 2019

4/01374/19/DRC - Details required by condition 3 (environmental report) attached to planning permission 4/02762/16/opa (change of use from office to residential)
APPRET -

4/01372/19/DRC - Details as required by condition 3 (noise assessment) attached to planning permission 4/01257/16/opa (change of use from office to residential.)
GRA - 7th August 2019

4/01364/19/DRC - Details required by condition 3(a-c) (contamination) attached to planning permission 4/02762/16/opa (change of use from office to Residential).
GRA - 31st July 2019

4/01170/19/FUL - Partial demolition of single-storey rear addition. Proposed change of use of yg20, yg21, yg22, yg23, yg27, yg28, yg29, yg30, yg31 from d2 to c3 residential to facilitate the provision of 4 x two-bedroom dwellings with amenity space and associated Parking.
GRA - 29th July 2019

4/01163/19/FUL - Re-elevation and associated operational works to buildings at akeman central yard comprising: amendments to existing doors/windows and replacement doors/windows; introduction of new doors/windows and juliet balconies; white render finish; grey door/window
GRA - 8th July 2019

4/01162/19/ROC - Variation of condition 3 (materials and design) attached to planning permission 4/02850/18/ful - demolition of 13 buildings (part and full as appropriate) and operational works to 12 buildings. Construction of 4 dwellings and associated parking. Addition
GRA - 8th July 2019

4/03166/18/OPA - Duplicate application with 3111/18
WDN - 25th February 2019

4/03111/18/OPA - Proposed conversion of vacant office units to create 7 x residential dwelling houses with associated parking
PRQG - 11th February 2019

4/02850/18/FUL - Demolition of 13 buildings (part and full as appropriate) and operational works to 12 buildings. Construction of 4 dwellings and associated parking. Addition of two new walled enclosures to provide amenity space to two Buildings.
GRA - 25th April 2019

4/00430/18/OTD - Change of use from storage to Residential.

DET -

4/00146/18/FUL - Operational works to buildings at Akeman business park comprising: amendments to existing windows and replacement windows; introduction of new windows and balconies; white render finish; grey fascia; red multi brick slip finish; removal of various stairca
GRA - 19th July 2018

4/02762/16/OPA - Change of use from office to residential
GRA - 30th November 2016

4/01257/16/OPA - Change of use from office to Residential.
PRQG - 15th September 2016

Appeals (If Any):

20/00059/REFU - Demolition of existing shed. Construction of two houses with parking, gardens and all ancillary works (includes roadway improvements/ alterations to those approved under permission 4/02850/18/FUL).
DIS - 27th April 2021

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL2

Tring Conservation Area

Former Land Use (Risk Zone):

General Employment Area: Akeman Street, Tring

Parish: Tring CP

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: RAF HALTON: DOTTED BLACK ZONE

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Tring)

Parking Standards: New Zone 3

Town: Tring

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

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

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

Core Strategy (2013):

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS8 - Sustainable Transport
CS9 - Management of Roads
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS13 - Quality of Public Realm
CS14 - Economic Development
CS15 - Office, Research, Industry, Storage and Distribution
CS27 - Heritage
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction
CS31 - Water Management
CS32 - Air, Water and Soil Quality

Local Plan (2004):

Policy 10 –Optimising the Use of Urban Land
Policy 13- Conditions
Policy 51- Development and Transport Impacts
Policy 54- Highway Design
Policy 58- Private Parking Provision
Policy 62- Cyclists
Policy 113- Exterior Lighting
Policy 118- Important Archaeological Remains
Policy 120- Development in Conservation Areas
Appendix 3 – Design and Layout of Residential Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Car Parking Standards (2020)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)
Environmental Guidelines (May 2004)
Area Based Policies (May 2004)
Water Conservation & Sustainable Drainage (June 2005)
Energy Efficiency & Conservation (June 2006)
Tring Conservation Area - Character Appraisal & Management Proposals

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
Heritage impacts
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The site is located within the urban area of Tring. Under Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Dacorum Core Strategy residential development is acceptable in principle.

9.3 Paragraph 22.8 of the Core Strategy (2013) recognises Akeman Street as a General Employment Area. Akeman Street is also listed as a General Employment Area in Policy 31 of the Local Plan (2004). However, Policy 31 does indicate that the Akeman Street allocation has not been saved and is therefore outdated.

9.4 Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the loss of employment units on site has been fully established in principle through multiple historic applications, through both prior approvals and full planning permission consents on site.

9.5 The case officer's delegated report for planning permission 4/02850/18/FUL (works and 4 new dwellings) noted that, in considering previous residential proposals "that the extant prior approvals, the apparent low levels of occupancy of existing employment uses and the Government push for the release of identified employment land carries sufficient weight to consider the loss of employment land at Akeman GEA acceptable."

9.6 This loss reflects the direct impact of the Government's support through permitted development rights for the conversion of industrial / office space to residential with the closure of many of the commercial units and the resultant incremental/ cumulative contraction/ attrition of the site's previously thriving vibrant local economic role.

9.7 In considering 4/02850/18 it was concluded that 'with such a significant decline there would now be no case to resist the further loss notwithstanding the evident visible negative economic impact for the local small business community on a site with a long employment history'.

9.8 Given this background the principle of additional housing at ABP is acceptable. This is with due regard to Policy CS17 which encourages the development of housing to meet the district housing allocation, with saved Policy 10 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan encouraging the use of urban land to be optimised. The approach is consistent with the aims of Section 5 of the NPPF in delivering a sufficient supply of homes.

9.9 Also, in considering the application, the Council does not have a demonstrable 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Under the NPPF's paragraph 11(d) planning permission should therefore be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or if specific policies within the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide clear reasons for refusal.

Impact on Surrounding Area and Heritage Assets.

9.10 Dacorum Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS12 require that new development is compatible with the established streetscape. This is reinforced by the design expectations for the Conservation Area as expressed through Policy CS27 and saved Dacorum Borough Local Plan Policy 120.

9.11 These policies reflect S72 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

9.12 Policy CS27 seeks to protect, conserve and if appropriate, enhance the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of heritage assets which reflects the statutory duties defined in the Act. Accordingly CS27 clarifies 'development will positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of conservation areas'. This reinforces the expectations of saved DBLP Policy 120.

9.13 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2021) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is

irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

9.14 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

9.15 Paragraph 203 of the NPPF The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

9.16 There is, and has been, no objection to the design of the proposed two dwellings. As previously noted in the officer's report for the previous application, "*The dwellings traditional/ contemporary design (massing, materials and details) would be compatible with the evolving overall appearance of this part of the Conservation Area as it is incrementally redeveloped. The location of the dwellings would reflect the location of the existing barn and represent a 'gateway' to the land to the rear*".

9.17 Furthermore, the proposed dwellings would not be visible from the street scenes of Akeman or Langdon Street. The positioning of the dwellings is closer to the Langdon Street entrance to the site, where more modern dwellings are located just to the north of the site.

9.18 The scale (7.65m in height), bulk and form of the proposed dwellings are considered acceptable when taking into account the surrounding context of the site. The proposed density of the application site would be 28.7 dwellings per hectare which is broadly consistent with the expectations of Policy 21 of the Local Plan (2004).

9.19 The main area of contention on the previous proposal was the proposed demolition of the drying shed, which was considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The associated appeal (APP/A1910/W/20/3259756) relating to the previous refusal was dismissed, with the inspector noting that the loss of the drying shed would result in the loss of a non-designated heritage asset and harm to the significance of the Conservation Area due to the loss of historic character.

9.20 It should however be noted that the inspector stated that "*While the shed is not attractive, and I do not find that its removal would be harmful to the appearance of the CA, there would be a loss of historic character because of the development*".

9.21 This application proposes the relocation of the shed to an existing parking area on site, rather than its demolition. The relocation would not result in harm to the appearance of the Conservation Area (noting the inspectors comments above) but would allow for its link to the historic industrial use of the site to be maintained.

9.22 The Conservation Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objection to the proposed re-location of the shed. A condition will be attached to any permission given where a scheme for the careful dismantling, storage and re-erection of the shed will have to be agreed in writing between the LPA and the applicants. The condition will also stipulate that works to relocate the drying shed shall be completed prior to occupation of the proposed dwellings.

9.23 details of materials, hard and soft landscaping will also be secured by condition.

9.24 Due to the above, it is considered that the primary (and singular) issue relating to the refusal of the previous planning application have now been overcome through the proposed relocation of the drying shed, rather than its demolition. As a result, the proposed development would not have a

detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, Conservation Area, and would result in the retention of a non-designated heritage asset on site.

Impact on Residential Amenity

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

9.26 It is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties in terms of loss of light, outlook, or privacy. The closest properties to the proposed dwellings would be numbers 15-17 Langdon Street. The proposed dwellings would be positioned approximately 16.15-16.55m from these properties which is considered an acceptable distance, noting that there is no specific side to back distance requirements contained within Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004).

9.27 The first floor side windows on the development would serve a bathroom and ensuite. These can be conditioned to be obscure glazed to ensure no overlooking issues occur.

9.28 The drying shed would be re-located to the rear of the site, and would be positioned close to the rear boundaries with some of the properties located along Langdon Street. However, due to the distance (approximately 22m) from these properties and the height (approximately 6m) of the drying shed, it is considered that this would not result a significant impact on the residential amenity of these properties. Moreover, the pitch of the barn would travel away from the rear boundaries, limiting the impact of the overall ridge height of the barn.

9.29 The rear garden depth of the first plot would be approximately 11.57m which would meet the 11.5m depth required by Saved Appendix 3 (2004). The rear garden depth of the second plot would measure approximately 9.2m which would represent a shortfall of 2.3m. However, this shortfall is considered moderate and for all intensive purposes, the garden size is considered functional in terms of allowance for seating/planting areas in order to enjoy a private outdoor space. The bedrooms would also be two bedroom properties and so could be considered starter homes under Saved Appendix, which allows for reductions in the 11.5m depth. Furthermore, Tring Memorial Gardens would be approximately a 9 minute walk from the site with Tring Park and approximate 15 minute walk.

9.30 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties and provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupiers of the development.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

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

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

9.33 It is important to note that the access route shown on the proposed site plan has already been granted under planning permission 4/02850/18/FUL. The proposed application also details some

alteration and further clarification to the approved junction to Langdon Street, which include the removal of part of the front wall and pier to widen the visibility from the junction.

9.34 There were initial concerns raised by both Hertfordshire Highways and Hertfordshire Fire and Rescue regarding the width of the access onto Langdon Street with regards to access for a fire appliance. As such, the agent has amended the site plan to increase the width of the access road to 3.7m which complies with current fire and rescue guidelines. Due to this, Hertfordshire Highways and Hertfordshire Fire and Rescue no longer have any objection to the plans.

9.35 In the context of the wider site, the access route would be part of a one way system on site, whereby entry to the site would be from Akeman Street, with the exit being onto Langdon Street. This has already been approved and condition on previous approvals on site.

9.36 Overall, it is considered that the introduction of two new dwellings on site would not attract significant vehicular movements that would result in detrimental impacts on the safety and operation of the wider highway network.

9.37 With regards to parking, each two bedroom dwelling would be served by two parking spaces which would comply with the Parking Standards SPD (2020). It is noted that the parking spaces would be tandem spaces. However, paragraph 8.5 of the Parking Standards SPD states that this can be appropriate for space on-plot within the curtilage of the dwelling if for use by the same property. Visitor spaces would also be available within the wider site. The dimensions of the drying shed would mean that its relocation would not impede on the previously approved parking spaces to the rear of the site, as these could still be accommodated underneath the shed.

9.38 With respect to the wider site, the overall layout and provision of parking had incrementally changed throughout multiple historic permissions, prior approvals and Section 73 amendment applications on site. The applicants have provided a comprehensive parking plan of the site which provides an up to date picture of parking provision. The plan features the associated planning consent reference numbers for individual elements of the wider site.

9.39 The plan shows that including this proposal, there would be a total of 69 parking spaces on site. 56 of these would be allocated to serve 56 bedrooms on site with an extra 13 spaces allocated as visitor parking. This plan does not include the permission for 24 basement parking spaces for the honours building under permission 4/00720/19/FUL which would increase total provision to 87 spaces on site.

9.40 Ultimately, the parking provision for the wider site is not under assessment under this application. The purpose of the plan is to show that this planning application would not result in inadequate provision for other approved units on site through displacement. It is also noted that the wider site includes secure cycle. As previously mentioned, the development allows for the adequate provision of parking to serve its own purposes under the Parking Standards SPD (2020).

9.41 It is noted that decision 4/01257/16/OPA for a change of use of an existing officer building to residential contained a site plan which showed parking for Langdon Street residents on the area covered by this application.

9.42 This was discussed extensively between the case officer of the previous application, the case officer for the 2016 prior approval consent and the applicants. The agent's correspondence dated 26 June 2020 is included below:

*"I am pleased to take the opportunity to clarify the planning situation regarding the Langdon street Parking shown on drawing 16001- 3PA01 rev A.
Drawing 16001- 3PA01 rev. A was the drawing which is referred to in the planning approval 4/01257/16/OPA*

The description associated with the a application was : Proposed residential conversion of Office business units referenced – Side yard units YG1, YG5, YG6.1-YG6.4, SG6, SG7, SF11, SF12- Yard Block units YG10-TG18, YG32-34, YF1-YF24 to create 24 residential dwelling houses with associated parking in accordance with the attached details.

The approval described the application as: Change of use from office to residential

The Parking spaces, which were shown on drawing ref: 3PA01 rev. A for the Langdon street residents, at the time were indicated at the request of another officer (sic) because we had originally included them within the scheme to accommodate parking for our proposals- The purpose of showing them was to show that our scheme as proposed could accommodate the required parking provision without including those parking spaces- which at the time the residents on Langdon street had an agreement with the then land owner to use.

The parking spaces have no planning status provided to them by the planning permission.

They are not referred to in the decision or the description. They are not included in the parking Key/Schedule. They are not mentioned in any obligation (because that wouldn't be legal) They are just referred to in away an application may refer to 'adjoining gardens' or something similar. They are for all intents and purposes excluded from the proposal as it was approved. The permission did not grant an obligation for the provision of the spaces it merely acknowledged their existence at the time.

Since the granting of permission 4/01257/16/OPA on 15th September 2016, my client has purchased the land on which the parking was situated and legally the residents of Langdon street no longer have permission to park in those spaces. This has allowed the spaces to either become further additional parking for my client's development or further space to enable efficient development. I hope this clarifies things for you on this matter.

In essence:

- • Prior approval cannot provide permission for something that does not relate to the need of the development proposed*
- • Planning approval cannot cover development that is not applied for"*

9.43 The above provides clarity over the situation regarding parking spaces which were originally available for residents on Langdon Street. However, this occurred by way of a separate agreement between the owners of the site and the residents. Their marking on the plan was for the avoidance of doubt but it is considered that the extent of the prior approval consent did not specifically cover these. There has also been no separate legal agreement tied to any permissions on site between the council and the land owners to ensure these were retained in perpetuity, nor would such an agreement be considered reasonable, if a development proposal itself adequately provided for its own parking needs.

9.44 It is considered that the planning application process can only be used to assess the parking provision of a proposed development in terms of its ability to accommodate for itself. The 2016 prior approval consent therefore does not extend to the previously noted 4 parking spaces for Langdon Resident Streets. This was marked on the site plan for clarity but was subject to a separate, private agreement between the landowners and the residents.

9.45 taken into account all of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the safety of operation of the highway and provide for sufficient parking arrangements. Furthermore, the comprehensive parking plan shows that sufficient parking provision would be retained on site for all of the historic planning consents that have taken place. It appears a separate, private agreement between the landowners and residents on Langdon Street for parking on site has expired, however, in this case, these spaces were never formally covered by a planning

consent or an associated legal agreement tied to a planning consent. Therefore, the loss of these spaces is not a material planning consideration for this application as the parking spaces in the first instance did not fall within the remit of the planning process.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Ecology

9.46 Ecological Bat building-inspection and activity surveys from 2017 and 2019 (covering a wider site and 12 buildings in total) which have been submitted did not highlight the Drying Shed to have any bat roosting potential.

9.47 Hertfordshire Ecology have noted that the surveys are slightly outdated. However, having regard to the submitted technical notes and the physical structure and condition of the shed, it was considered that the building was sub optimal in terms of potential for roosting bats. Therefore, the ecology officer had no objection to the proposal. A bat informative was recommended with regards to foraging bats in the area and the proposed relocation works of the shed.

Waste Management

9.47 The proposed site plan indicates bin storage areas for both units. The carry distance for these areas are compliant with Dacorum's Refuse Storage Guidance Note (2015). It is noted that the storage area indicated for one of the units would be impinged by the parking area in terms of access. It is considered that it is more likely that residents of this unit would store their bins to the front of the property due to this issue. However, soft landscaping on the frontage is indicated (and will be secured by condition) which would assist in softening the frontage and screening storage. Overall, it is considered the presence of bin storage for one of the units to the front would not have a significant impact on the wider character of the area and refusal on this basis alone would not be sustained.

Contaminated Land

9.48 The scientific officer was consulted on the application. A geo-environmental report was submitted with the application. Two soil sampling locations were targeted in the area of the application site in March 2019 and in one of the two sampling locations chrysotile asbestos fibres (0.641%) were detected in the shallow made ground in the location of the proposed gardens. The scientific officer recognised that a remediation strategy has been agreed with regards to the wider Akeman Site, however, those strategies did not recognise the need for remediation methods on this particular area of the site. As such, a condition relating to the submission of a remediation statement for this part of the site will be secured by condition.

Trees and Woodlands

9.49 The tree officer had no objection to the proposed development, noting that there are no tree or landscape issues which would pose a constraint to development.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.9 The application is CIL liable.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 In conclusion, the principle of residential development on the site has been established through numerous historic prior approval consents and planning permissions. Furthermore, the Akeman Business Park is no longer saved as a General Employment Area under Policy 31 of the Local Plan (2004).

10.2 The development is considered acceptable with regards to the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area, its impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, and on Highway and Parking grounds. The primary, and sole issue relating to the refusal of planning application 20/00818/FUL has now been addressed through the proposal to relocate drying shed rather than demolish it. The Conservation Officer is satisfied with this approach and a condition will ensure that a scheme for the shed's dismantling, storage, repair and re-mantling is agreed in writing prior to the commencement of the development.

10.3 Due to this, the development is considered acceptable with regards to local and national policy and is therefore recommended for approval.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 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/documents:**

**PL02 Rev A
PL-03 Rev A3
PL-04 Rev A3
PL-08 Rev A3
PL-07 Rev A3**

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

3. **No development (excluding demolition/ground investigations) shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

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

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

- o all external hard surfaces within the site;
- o other surfacing materials;
- o means of enclosure;

- o soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs;
- o minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, signs, refuse or other storage units, etc.); and
- o retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

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

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

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

5. **Prior to commencement of the development of the development hereby permitted, a scheme noting the numbering of the drying shed's timbers, its careful dismantling by hand, their storage at a secure and dry location, repair works in matching timber, and re-erection to the rear of the site shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and completed prior to the occupation of the dwellinghouses hereby granted.

Reason: To ensure that the character or appearance of the designated heritage asset is preserved or enhanced and for the retention of the non-designated heritage asset on site as required per Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

6. (a) **No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.**
- (b) **This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:**
- (i) **All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (a) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.**
 - (ii) **A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.**

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

7. **Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 1 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning**

Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.

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.

8. **Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of the layout and siting of Electric Vehicle Charging Points and any associated infrastructure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until these measures have been provided and these measures shall thereafter be retained fully in accordance with the approved details.**

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

9. **The window at first floor level in the side elevations of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings in accordance with Policy CS12 (c) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 130 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and during the determination process which lead to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.
2. In the event of bats or evidence of them being found, work must stop immediately and advice taken on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England to avoid an offence being committed.
3. Works within the highway (section 278): The applicant is advised that in order to comply with this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to enter into an agreement with Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the satisfactory completion of the access and associated road improvements. The construction of such works must be undertaken to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available via the County Council website at: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Conservation & Design (DBC)	<p>The drying shed is an important part of the history of the site and this has been noted in the recent appeal decision APP/A1910/W/20/3259756. As such the appeal for its demolition was dismissed.</p> <p>The retention of the drying shed and relocation to form a car port was previously discussed at a pre application stage. After reviewing the proposals we would support this provided that the roofing material was a dark blue corrugated steel sheeting. The weatherboarding should be painted black and any new should match existing. As much of the historic fabric of the timber frame should be retained as possible. The timbers should be numbered safely stored and reused. The timbers should be repaired with agreement of the conservation officer. The barn should be put up and be in use before the second home proposed is occupied.</p> <p>The proposed design, materials and location of the new dwellings are acceptable. They would complement the other converted buildings in the overall development. As such we would not object to the proposals and it would have a neutral impact on the character of the conservation area.</p>

	<p>Recommendation The drying shed timbers should be numbered, carefully dismantled by hand, stored at a secure and dry location, repaired in matching timber (following agreement in writing with the local authority, and then re-erected on the site. The drying shed works should be complete before occupation of the second dwelling is permitted.</p> <p>External materials, hard and soft landscaping subject to approval.</p>
Parish/Town Council	<p>The Council recommended REFUSAL on the following grounds: overdevelopment of the site would have a negative impact on neighbouring residents - both within the Business Park and the surrounding streets (Conservation Area); there is no explanation of where the drying shed is to be relocated; concerns about access to and from the site were also raised.</p> <p>19.08.2021:</p> <p>Tring Town Council recommend REFUSAL of this application on the grounds of over-development, concerns as to who would be responsible for the drying shed in the future and the parking issue caused by the re-location.</p>
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<p>The application is for the relocation of existing dilapidated drying shed and construction of 2no. two bedroom houses with parking, gardens and all ancillary works. The works also includes roadway improvements/ alterations to those approved under permission 4/02850/18/FUL at Drying Shed, Akeman Business Park, Akeman Street, Tring.</p> <p>This is an 'other' response as there is concerns regarding the reduction of the existing entrance to 3 metres which could hinder a fire appliances access in case of an emergency. Fire appliances often require 3.7 metres for an internal road network as per building regulations. From Akeman Yard Site plan, there is concerns of the internal route network and a fire appliance. As such the fire service have been asked to comment and any decision made by them will be backed by HCC Highways. Although this application is just for 2 dwellings, this must be thought of in terms of the wider site area.</p> <p>14.07.2021:</p> <p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.</p>

Highway Informatives

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

AN 1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence.

Further information is available via the County Council website at: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN 2) Obstruction of highway: 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 County Council website at: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN 3) Debris and deposits on the highway: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit compost, dung or other material for dressing land, or any rubbish on a made up carriageway, or any or other debris on a highway to the interruption of any highway user. 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 and use thereafter are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN 4) Works within the highway (section 278): The applicant is advised that in order to comply with this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to enter into an agreement with Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority under Section 278 of the

	<p>Highways Act 1980 to ensure the satisfactory completion of the access and associated road improvements. The construction of such works must be undertaken to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available via the County Council website at: https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p> <p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>The application is for the relocation of the existing dilapidated drying shed and construction of 2no. two bedroom houses with parking, gardens and all ancillary works. The works also includes roadway improvements/ alterations to those approved under permission 4/02850/18/FUL at Drying Shed, Akeman Business Park, Akeman Street, Tring. HCC Highways previously commented with an 'other' response owing to the narrow exit access being 3 metres which would not allow a fire appliance to enter the site.</p> <p>Subsequently the case officer has been in contact with the fire service and a new revised access has been proposed which would be 3.7 metres. The 2 new dwellings within this application fall within a much larger site of 50 plus dwellings. The internal route layout will be a one way system so the new dwellings are located near the exit of the one way system. Any new works within the highway network in relation to the widened access will need to be completed through a section 278 agreement – please see informative 4 above. The parking for the new dwelling and the route layout allows vehicles to turn on site and enter the highway network in forward gear.</p> <p>Provision would need to be made for an on-site bin-refuse store within 30m of each dwelling and within 25m of the kerbside/bin collection point. The collection method must be confirmed as acceptable by DBC waste management.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>In relation to the 2 dwelling in question for this proposal, HCC Highways would not wish to restrict a grant of permission for this application. This is following an agreement between the LPA and the Fire service regarding the fire safety of the site. Any work within the highway network will need to be completed through a section 278 agreement.</p>
Trees & Woodlands	There are no trees or landscape issues that are a constraint to development.

	<p>Landscape details as referred to in drawing PL02 should be conditioned.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>Having reviewed the documentation submitted with the above planning application, in particular the WDE Geo-environmental Report (March 2019) and having considered the information held by the Environmental Health Department I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed development.</p> <p>However, the application form erroneously states that there is no contamination associated with the application site and that the proposed end use is not vulnerable to the presence of contamination.</p> <p>Two soil sampling locations were targeted in the area of the application site in March 2019 and in one of the two sampling locations chrysotile asbestos fibres (0.641%) were detected in the shallow made ground in the location of the proposed gardens.</p> <p>It is recognised that a Remedial Strategy (WDE report dated November 2019) has been submitted and agreed in relation to the larger Akeman Business Park. However, given that there does not appear to be an awareness of the need for this area to be remediated in line with the recommendations of that report the below conditions include the requirement for a Remediation Method Statement.</p> <p>If the above referenced Remedial Strategy, along with an addendum to detail the specific approach that will be taken to the garden areas for this particular application site, is submitted and agreed in advance of the planning decision being reached, then part (a) of the below condition will not need to be included.</p> <p><u>Contaminated Land Conditions:</u></p> <p>Condition 1:</p> <p>(a) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>(b) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:</p> <p>(i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (a) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.</p> <p>(ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local</p>

	<p>Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.</p> <p>Condition 2: Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 1 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.</p> <p>Informatives: The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) & (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.</p> <p>The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land.</p>
Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue	<p>In response to the Planning Application: 21/01870/FUL (HCC ref. DA/7097/2021) Site: Drying Shed Akeman Business Park requesting the narrowing of the emergency access onto Langdon Street. It is recommended that the road should measure 3.7 meters between kerbs to enable fire appliances to enter the development without issues.</p> <p>14.07.2021:</p> <p>Thank you for confirming that the agent has agreed to the 3.7m access for the fire appliance, this authority had no objections.</p>
Hertfordshire Ecology	<p>Bat building-inspection and activity surveys from 2017 and 2019 (covering a wider site and 12 buildings in total) did not highlight the Drying Shed to have any bat roosting potential. Although these surveys are at least two years old, the submitted Technical Note and photos show the building in question to be in a deteriorating state; it is largely an open-sided timber frame structure with corrugated sheet roof. The</p>

	<p>former will provide draughty conditions and the former allow for fluctuating temperatures near the roof - both of which are not ideal conditions for roosting bats.</p> <p>I consider the building to be sub-optimal for bats to use for roosting and do not consider an updated bat survey is necessary in this instance. However, as bats have been recorded foraging and commuting across the wider site, I recommend a precautionary approach to relocation works affecting the Drying Shed and advise the following Informative is added to any consent given:</p> <p>"In the event of bats or evidence of them being found, work must stop immediately and advice taken on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England to avoid an offence being committed."</p> <p>The proposed green landscaped areas can only enhance the previously developed site for biodiversity.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
30	7	0	7	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
4 Albert Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AU	<p>This historical structure has been designated as having historical value to the town of Tring. If I honestly believed it could be moved without damage I would be less concerned. However the developers have a culture of utter disregard for the Conservation Area and neighbours property. I am currently in a situation where they refuse to offer or issue me with a party boundary wall agreement and they relentlessly continue to trespass on my property during their building works. They also cut down a mature tree to ease positioning their scaffolding without consent.</p> <p>I really think that granting relocation of the drying shed would lead to them declaring it unsalvageable and ultimately destroying it.</p> <p>I would hope that you will consult Historic England before making any decisions in a Conservation Area. The owners of the site are currently allowing another listed building to deteriorate rapidly, one would presume that is to allow it to fall into such disrepair that it is deemed unsalvageable.</p> <p>Additionally I would like to add that in it's entirety there is inadequate parking provision being allocated within the site. Please come to Tring</p>

	<p>Triangle at 6.30pm and try to park in the residential streets - because you won't be able to! 1.4 parking spaces may be adequate in other developments, but in this conservation area it is not. This light industrial site that is now under development to residential use used to provide work within the town centre that so many employees walked to. Now it is housing more people need more cars to get to out of town industrial sites, where the buses don't run to. Please don't make a desperate situation worse and please conserve our history. Thank you.</p>
<p>13 Albert Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AU</p>	<p>I wish to object for the following reasons: This building is too fragile to be moved, and is a unique heritage site, which should be kept as such. It is also an important building for the birds nesting under the roof, and for the bats The developer has deliberately broken the law by starting to dismantle the roof before he has been given permission, and given that the roof is asbestos has deliberately ignored any health and safety considerations. There is insufficient parking for this development, and when E/20/00149/NAP, Reported Breach: Breach of landscaping condition (1) of permission 4/01459/01/FUL has been investigated and the landscaping has been re-instated, there will be even less parking available. The trees that were removed and were providing screening MUST be replaced like for like, and doing so will ensure that less space is available for parking, therefore any further development MUST NOT BE ALLOWED. Can it be guaranteed that there will be NO overflow of cars parking in the already overcrowded Tring Triangle? If not, then any further development of this site must be refused. Charles Ashwell. 13 Albert Street.</p>
<p>16 Langdon Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AZ</p>	<p>Where to begin. Again it is the same arguments that have been brought up on all the objections that have gone before on the building of these new properties with the demolition/ relocation of the drying shed. These developers do feel that they can do as they please. They think they can just break the law and dismantle the drying shed without permission using unsafe practices to remove Asbestos from the roof just goes to show they do as they please.</p> <p>So once again we are objecting to the plans to relocate the drying shed and build 2 new houses. At every stage we have objected to the over development and destruction of this site. It will have a negative impact on the Triangle with increased traffic, noise, pollution and a negative impact on safety The original plans for change of use in 2016 provided adequate parking for the proposed development, local businesses and the plan also accommodated existing parking arrangements in the park for local residents. We were satisfied with this development and approved this plan on the basis that the parking accommodations in the plan would not be degraded.</p> <p>The original 2016 plan provided 70 spaces for both new residential units, spaces for offices and commercial spaces and four spaces for existing local residents . reference: 4/01257/16/OPA Site Location Map.</p>

The new plan has 52 parking spaces and additional properties. This is a massive degrading to the original change of use submission.

Langdon Street and the Tring Triangle has very limited parking as you know which cannot accommodate all the local residents vehicles currently. So why will this development be a perfect parking storm?

1) The car park is currently always full with office workers working in the recently refurbished commercial and office spaces in the park. No parking provision is being made to accommodate all these workers once the current parking is allocated to flats. Where will they park? The Tring Triangle.

2) The provision of parking for Langdon Street residents in the original change of use has been removed, meaning 4 more vehicles on Langdon Street.

3) There is not enough parking spaces in the new plan for the new flats. 3 bedroom flats are being allocated 1 space. This is not enough parking for a 3 bedroom flat ! . Where will the extra vehicles park... The Tring Triangle.

This development is going to have a major impact on the local community. The Secretary of State Appeal, APP/ A1910/W.20/3259756 which dismissed the demolition of the hop shed and construction of two homes makes it very clear (as did Dacorum and Town Councils) that the Hop Shed should be retained and not moved. I agree with Tring Council, Dacorum Council, The Secretary Of State Dept and numerous others that this building should be retained and restored.

2) The Developers have already started dismantling the Shed. We believe they have caused further damage to the structure. The builders dismantling it are not qualified (to our knowledge) in the preservation of historic buildings and little care seems to have been taken. Only a large number of local residents arriving on site prevented further damage.

3) when dismantling they destroyed numerous bird nests in fledgling season .

4) bats are living in the shed and have been seen visually and via detectors.

The new houses will directly overlook my garden AND ON MEASURING IT TODAY THE NEW PROPERTIES WILL BE NEARLY 2 METERS HIGHER THAN THE BARN AND WILL HAVE 3 WINDOWS THAT WILL OVERLOOK 15,16 and 17 LANGDON STREEET.

There is then the issue of loss of light and noise that would be associated with the new properties.

We ask you once again to do the right thing and refuse this application.

Thankyou.

Again we are objecting to this application. The substance of the

application hasn't changed . All that has happened is the developer has submitted colour drawings of the road and parking. This doesn't change the original objections.

The developer thinks he can do as he likes as he has already instructed the builder to start dismantling the barn, and they did this by starting to remove Asbestos sheets from the roof without any of the safety precautions in place that are required by law.

All this new plan does is suggest that we will lose even more parking on Langdon Street.

Again they time this application to perfection. At first it was the start of the pandemic and this one in the middle of the holidays when alot of the neighbours are away on holiday. They have also posted 3 further applications this week. They are priceless.

Words fail me to describe them. So all I am doing is copy and paste the objection already submitted to this application as i have already said nothing has changed. Where to begin. Again it is the same arguments that have been bought up on all the objections that have gone before on the building of these new properties with the demolition/ relocation of the drying shed.

These developers do feel that they can do as they please. They think they can just break the law and dismantle the drying shed without permission using unsafe practices to remove Asbestos from the roof just goes to show they do as they please.

So once again we are objecting to the plans to relocate the drying shed and build 2 new houses.

At every stage we have objected to the over development and destruction of this site. It will have a negative impact on the Triangle with increased traffic, noise, pollution and a negative impact on safety The original plans for change of use in 2016 provided adequate parking for the proposed development, local businesses and the plan also accommodated existing parking arrangements in the park for local residents. We were satisfied with this development and approved this plan on the basis that the parking accommodations in the plan would not be degraded.

The original 2016 plan provided 70 spaces for both new residential units, spaces for offices and commercial spaces and four spaces for existing local residents . reference: 4/01257/16/OPA Site Location Map.

The new plan has 52 parking spaces and additional properties. This is a massive degrading to the original change of use submission.

Langdon Street and the Tring Triangle has very limited parking as you know which cannot accommodate all the local residents vehicles currently. So why will this development be a perfect parking storm?

1) The car park is currently always full with office workers working in the recently refurbished commercial and office spaces in the park. No parking provision is being made to accommodate all these workers once the current parking is allocated to flats. Where will they park? The Tring Triangle.

2) The provision of parking for Langdon Street residents in the original change of use has been removed, meaning 4 more vehicles on Langdon Street.

	<p>3) There is not enough parking spaces in the new plan for the new flats. 3 bedroom flats are being allocated 1 space. This is not enough parking for a 3 bedroom flat! Where will the extra vehicles park... The Tring Triangle.</p> <p>This development is going to have a major impact on the local community. The Secretary of State Appeal, APP/A1910/W.20/3259756 which dismissed the demolition of the hop shed and construction of two homes makes it very clear (as did Dacorum and Town Councils) that the Hop Shed should be retained and not moved. I agree with Tring Council, Dacorum Council, The Secretary Of State Dept and numerous others that this building should be retained and restored.</p> <p>2) The Developers have already started dismantling the Shed. We believe they have caused further damage to the structure. The builders dismantling it are not qualified (to our knowledge) in the preservation of historic buildings and little care seems to have been taken. Only a large number of local residents arriving on site prevented further damage.</p> <p>3) when dismantling they destroyed numerous bird nests in fledgling season .</p> <p>4) bats are living in the shed and have been seen visually and via detectors.</p> <p>The new houses will directly overlook my garden AND ON MEASURING IT TODAY THE NEW PROPERTIES WILL BE NEARLY 2 METERS HIGHER THAN THE BARN AND WILL HAVE 3 WINDOWS THAT WILL OVERLOOK 15,16 and 17 LANGDON STREEET. There is then the issue of loss of light and noise that would be associated with the new properties.</p> <p>We ask you once again to do the right thing and refuse this application.</p>
<p>14 Langdon Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AZ</p>	<p>I am once again, writing to object on the strongest possible grounds to the revised plans to relocate the drying shed and to construct two two-bedroomed houses on the Akeman Business Park site. I have written many times about the over development of the site, and the consequent negative impacts on the wellbeing and safety o the local community due to the increased congestion, noise, pollution and environmental damage. These impacts affect the entire community living in the Tring conservation area, numbering multiple households, which, alone, easily outweighs the limited public good gained from two additional houses on the site.</p> <p>These houses will be new constructions in a densely built developed site in an area where there has not previously been housing or commercial offices, removing parking and preventing access to back gardens, and hence have a disproportionate impact on residents. The residents parking that has been removed by the developers was previously used by residents for more than 20 years, and their cars have now substantially increased congestion in the already congested Tring Triangle Conservation Area, with serious negative impacts on its</p>

heritage value. The developers reneged on a change of use application where they had previously agreed to keep this parking in place.

The new houses will also remove the back access to houses, that has been used since the houses were constructed in the early 19th century, thus preventing access including for garden work, building repairs and fire safety. My house at number 14 Langdon Street is particularly seriously affected, and I now have no option but to put my bins on the street, that obstruct the road, and I have lost back access to my shed, preventing my use of a bicycle for transport (Tring has notoriously poor transport to the rail station which is a long way out of town down a long unlit street).

However, not only will this development have a serious impact on my wellbeing and health and that of my neighbours and the wider Tring Triangle community, but it will also affect a structure of historical heritage and environmental value. The Akeman Business Park was a small scale commercial and industrial area in the 19th century. The hop barn, or drying shed, represents this heritage past and has been on this site since the development of Tring's active and significant brewing industry. This shed, on this site, has a meaningful symbolic representation of this industrial past, on a site where these developers have removed all such other heritage buildings. Moving the drying shed to another area on the site will break the place-based context that is critical to this heritage feature. It is this specific place-based context which gives meaning to the understanding of the history of the site and provides value to the wider Conservation Area. Relocation also exposes the barn to potentially catastrophic damage, indeed, the developers have already noted themselves that the condition of the building prevents its relocation.

It is worth noting that, before the recent development of this site by Aurient, there were many other buildings of heritage value on the site. The drying shed is the building of heritage value that is still reasonably intact, and hence the harm of its removal should be seen in the wider context of the removal of other such representations of this industrial past within this site in the Tring Conservation Area. Given this, it is not too much to require that this remaining reminder of Tring's industrial past should remain on the site where it was originally built.

The drying shed also supports a diversity of wildlife, including providing nesting, foraging and roosting sites for birds and bats. It is currently used as a nesting site by blackbirds, wrens, robins and sparrows. It is also used by multiple bat species, including common pipistrelle, brown long-eared bat, and Daubenton's myotis. This wildlife also depends on the ivy around the barn which will be destroyed if it is moved.

These developers have not acted in good faith throughout the development of this site. As I have mentioned before, I am in full support of sensitive and sustainable developments that meet local housing needs while respecting the needs of residents and our environment and historical heritage. These developers have inflicted multiple breaches of agreements on the local community and appear to be motivated only by profit without concern for the damage they propose to inflict on our historical heritage and environment, with long

term impacts on community cohesion, health and wellbeing. I hope that you will reject this planning application.

I attach as an annex my previous statement about the damage that this development has inflicted on me.

Annex: Previous objections

14 Langdon Street
Tring
Herts

Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

29th November 2020

cc: Nigel Gibbs, Nigel Nutkins, Joseph Stopps

RE: APP/A1910/2/20/3259756 - Akeman Business Park - Tring
Hertfordshire HP23 6AZ

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I am writing to submit my response to the above referenced appeal. This response is additional to the submission by Joseph Stopps on behalf of residents, including myself, living adjacent to the development on Akeman Business Park. Specifically, I wish to report the impacts of the proposed development on my personal situation at 14 Langdon Street.

The joint letter submitted by Joseph Stopps, and included in my covering email, provides an overview of the proposed development and the reasons for widespread community objections to the proposal. Briefly, the proposed plans will overdevelop an important heritage site, destroy a historically important hop barn, remove nesting and roosting sites for local wildlife and damage the character of the Tring Conservation Area. Parking and congestion have been a severe problem in the Tring Triangle Conservation Area for some years, and now pose risks of blocked access to emergency vehicles and threaten the well-being of local residents and community cohesion. These issues were made clear by local residents during the change of use application for Akeman Business Park in 2016, and led to a modification of these plans to deliver a change of use agreement that was acceptable to all parties as a workable compromise. The planning application submitted, however, reneges on this agreement, with a substantial increase in residential development (a higher number of dwellings of a larger average size), the removal of the business component of the plan (increasing the pressure on night-time parking), the destruction of the hop barn and the withdrawal of parking provision for Langdon Street residents. The grounds for the community's objections to these changes are covered in our joint letter submitted by Mr Stopps.

However, the development has additional impacts on my property and well-being that have not been covered by our joint letter. I have lived on Langdon Street for 19 years (I have lived at my present house since 2012), and throughout that time residents of numbers 10-14 have had parking and access into the Akeman Business Park through their back gardens. This has kept their vehicles off the congested streets and provided step-free access to gardens. For me, in particular, this back access was critically important as I have no alternative access into my garden except up and down two flights of stairs through my house. Despite this long-term historical access to our gardens, which has almost certainly been used since the houses were built in the 19th century, the developer has erected a fence at the rear of our properties, without our permission, blocking all access. The structure of the front of my home, which has no storage space, means the proposed development forces me to put my bins, which used to be kept in my back garden, on the street. These bins now blocks pedestrian access and add to community conflicts. The proposed development would make this situation permanent. It is worth noting that the developer could have very easily allowed continued back access, with minimal impacts on their development; not doing so provides evidence of their lack of regard for the local community concerns. I have investigated a legal challenge, which I would likely win, but the costs were prohibitive. Unscrupulous developers, of course, are fully aware that they have big pockets to fight such challenges, while local residents have limited resources to take them to court.

There are also knock-on impacts of overdevelopment of this site. Just before this development started, and in response to the climate crisis, I had been making investments as part of my plan to switch my car to electric and get a bike, in order to minimise my use of fossil fuels. I had, in fact, just installed the shed that was to house my bike when this development began. My plans for both bike and electric car are now on hold due to the proposed development. The bike requires access to my back garden and shed as I have nowhere else to store it. The electric vehicle depends on my having access to a reliable charging point; the loss of my parking space and the congestion of the streets, makes this impossible. I know of at least one of my neighbours who was planning to take similar steps which have also been put on hold due the threat of this development. When overdevelopment takes place without regard to existing residents' needs, this creates barriers against the ability of residents to contribute to meeting critical climate targets.

The destruction of the hop barn has additional significance. Tring used to have an industrial core within the Tring Triangle Conservation Area, with a long history in brewing. Little by little the remnants of this industrial heritage have been removed by development after development. The Akeman Business Park development has now removed nearly every piece of this building heritage that still remained, and the hop barn is the only remaining symbol of this industrial past. The role of the Tring Triangle Conservation Area is to preserve significant heritage, such as this barn. The barn not only serves to remind us of our past, but it also provides important nesting areas for birds and roosting sites for bats, thus making a valuable contribution to biodiversity, as well as to our historical heritage. It must not be

	<p>removed.</p> <p>These developers have not acted in good faith throughout the development of this site. I am in full support of sensitive developments that meet local housing needs while respecting the needs of residents and our environment and historical heritage. The local community cares deeply about our local area, the need for affordable and sustainable housing, but also the threats posed to our town's character and history, and we have been active in identifying our concerns. However, we have been overwhelmed by the developers' strategy of issuing multiple applications for a single site, and hiding critical changes within different applications. In particular, we have found the current appeals process to be lacking in transparency. We believe that the developers have misled the community and the council in their original change of use application, are motivated only by profit, without concern for the damage they propose to inflict on our historical heritage and environment. I hope that you will reject their appeal, and suggest the developers work in line with the original agreement around the change of use.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>[name redacted]</p> <p>I have already commented on this plan to further overdevelop the site. Adding colours to the drawing do nothing to diminish the damage that this development will do to the local community. The development is already feeling overcrowded, windows now look directly into my garden and into my house and the developers have blocked up my back gate without my permission forcing me to put my bins on the highway. There has been no provision of parking spaces to make up for the spaces that have been taken away by the development, and the unacceptable pressures on street parking are damaging community cohesion. The proposed development will further add to these impacts.</p> <p>Overall, this development continues to cause the local community substantial stress to a degree where it is seriously affecting the wellbeing of many individuals, including myself. The onslaught of plans and their revisions is clearly designed to confuse and demotivate local residents. The drying barn has been a source of much solace over the two decades I have lived here, as it has provided nesting space for multiple bird species and roosting space for bats. Elsewhere on the site, trees and green space have already been removed by the developers, who have shown scant regard for local wildlife. Indeed, their removal of a section of roof on the barn resulted in the destruction of at least two nests. The barn is now the sole place-based reminder of the industrial past of the site, an important historical remnant of the brewing industry that is fundamental to the history of the site and which was a key activity in the Tring Conservation Area.</p> <p>The developers have shown little concern for the community and our local environment and appear motivated only by profit. Please refer to my other comment for further information.</p>
13 Langdon Street	I object to the new plan for the same reasons I objected to the previous

Tring
Hertfordshire
HP23 6AZ

plan to remove the Ancient Hop Shed. Which is copied below.

In addition I would like to state :

1) The Secretary of State Appeal, APP/ A1910/W.20/3259756 which dismissed the demolition of the hop shed and construction of two homes makes it very clear (as did Dacorum and Town Councils) that the Hop Shed should be retained and not moved. I agree with Tring Council, Dacorum Council, The Secretary Of State Dept and numerous others that this building should be retained and restored.

2) The Developers have already started dismantling the Shed. We believe they have caused further damage to the structure. The builders dismantling it are not qualified (to our knowledge) in the preservation of historic buildings and little care seems to have been taken. Only a large number of local residents arriving on site prevented further damage.

3) when dismantling they destroyed numerous bird nests in fledgling season . I counted 6.

4) bats are living in the shed and have been seen visually and via detectors.

Original objection :

We object wholeheartedly to this plan as it will cause a perfect storm of parking problems for the Tring Triangle.

The original plans for change of use in 2016 provided adequate parking for the proposed development, local businesses and the plan also accommodated existing parking arrangements in the park for local residents. We were satisfied with this development and approved this plan on the basis that the parking accommodations in the plan would not be degraded.

The original 2016 plan provided 70 spaces for both new residential units, spaces for offices and commercial spaces and four spaces for existing local residents . reference: 4/01257/16/OPA Site Location Map.

The new plan has 52 parking spaces and additional properties. This is a massive degrading to the original change of use submission.

Langdon Street and the Tring Triangle has very limited parking as you know which cannot accommodate all the local residents vehicles currently. So why will this development be a perfect parking storm?

1) The car park is currently always full with office workers working in the recently refurbished commercial and office spaces in the park. No parking provision is being made to accommodate all these workers once the current parking is allocated to flats. Where will they park? The Tring Triangle.

2) The provision of parking for Langdon Street residents in the original

	<p>change of use has been removed, meaning 4 more vehicles on Langdon Street.</p> <p>3) There is not enough parking spaces in the new plan for the new flats. 3 bedroom flats are being allocated 1 space. This is not enough parking for a 3 bedroom flat ! . Where will the extra vehicles park... The Tring Triangle.</p> <p>This development is going to have a major impact on the local community. I object to the new plan for the same reasons I objected to the previous plan to remove the Ancient Hop Shed. Which is copied below.</p> <p>In addition I would like to state :</p> <p>1) The Secretary of State Appeal, APP/ A1910/W.20/3259756 which dismissed the demolition of the hop shed and construction of two homes makes it very clear (as did Dacorum and Town Councils) that the Hop Shed should be retained and not moved. I agree with Tring Council, Dacorum Council, The Secretary Of State Dept and nuneous others that this building should be retained and restored.</p> <p>2) The Developers have already started dismantling the Shed. We believe they have caused possible damage to the structure and exposed it to the elements. The builders dismantling it are not qualified (to our knowledge) in the preservation of historic buildings and little care seems to have been taken. Only a large number of local residents arriving on site prevented further possible damage.</p> <p>3) when dismantling they destroyed and exposed numerous bird nests in fledgling season . I counted 6.</p> <p>4) bats are living in the shed and have been seen visually and via detectors.</p>
<p>52 Langdon Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6BA</p>	<p>As a resident of Langdon Street may I object to this application:-</p> <p>1. I remain concerned at the overdevelopment of this site, general parking adequacy plus the latest plan to resite a heritage asset.</p> <p>2. The Drying Shed was designated as being of historical significance in the recent appeal decision (APP/A1910/W/20/3259756). My preference is to see this structure restored in situ, particularly as its present siting adds to the character of the development. It is also well known that demolishing and rebuilding such structures is rarely straightforward and can lead to loss of heritage assets. The area involved could also easily provide additional parking for the development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in the event the Council is willing to consider the request to reposition the Shed I would ask that the following points be considered:- (i) that the Council's Conservation Officer overviews the project (ii) use of Specialist Heritage contractors is made mandatory (iii) detailed plans are submitted and then approved (iv) Specialist Asbestos contractors are engaged to remove the roof covering & (v) that the Shed is fully reconstructed within the site before any</p>

	<p>occupancy can occur of the 2 proposed houses.</p> <p>3. Local parking constraints within Tring Triangle are both well-known and well reported. Any parking provision mitigation is thus clearly inappropriate in respect of this development. Whilst the developers parking plan has been redrawn, it nevertheless highlights that only 57 spaces (inc. visitor) are planned to be allocated across the 45 units in the residential development. This includes 5 spaces in the proposed underground car park in the Honours Building. Further parking is also required for the offices that form part of the overall site.</p> <p>In the event the Council is willing to consider granting planning permission for the 2 houses, may I request that the Council:- (i) ensure "maximum standards of parking provision" are achieved to cover the residential and office properties in line with the parameters of their Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document of November 2020; AND with no mitigation applied & (ii) make it a condition that the Honours Building underground parking is made fully available before any occupancy can occur of the 2 proposed houses.</p>
<p>Whitenap Langdon Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AZ</p>	<p>I object to the proposed developments on numerous grounds.</p> <p>1 - There are birds nesting in the drying shed. Removal of the shed removes their Habitat which I believe is not within the law.</p> <p>2 - In the previous attempts by the developer to remove this building they confirmed it would not be salvageable. Given the flagrant disregard shown by this developer for the local area thus far, I firmly believe they will determine halfway through the "relocation process" that it is unsalvageable.</p> <p>3 - This development places meaningful risk to safety of local people. As has already been discussed and agreed with by DBC via previous applications, further dwellings in this areas without suitable parking provision would be dangerous.</p> <p>4 - It seems that this application would reduce the width of access to lower than 3.7 metres which is the required width for a Fire Engine. Are the Council happy to approve an application that could well lead to loss of life in Emergency services cannot gain access?</p> <p>5- Unless the planning site has not been accurately updated, I understand that this application has not yet been approved. I would therefore question why yesterday (27 May 2021) large sections of the Roof were removed. To my knowledge this contravenes numerous laws.</p>