

ITEM NUMBER: 5c

21/01712/FUL	Construction of a new 5 bed dwelling	
Site Address:	Land adjacent to 10 Glendale, Hemel Hempstead	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Daniels/Mr Browne	
Case Officer:	Robert Freeman	
Parish/Ward:	Hemel Hempstead	Boxmoor
Referral to Committee:	The application is referred to committee at the request of Cllr Allen. Cllr Allen is concerned with regards the felling of mature beech trees within the site to facilitate the provision of a development plot and that following replacement of these trees that the construction works would significantly inhibit new trees achieve full maturity resulting in significant harm to the visual amenities of the area.	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 The construction of a new residential unit within this area of Hemel Hempstead would support the delivery of the housing target in accordance with Policies CS1, CS2 and CS17 of the Core Strategy.
- 2.2 The proposed dwelling is considered to constitute an acceptable form of development that would not result in any significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties nor highways safety in accordance with Policies CS8, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011 and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)
- 2.3 An appropriate level of residential amenity would be provided for future occupants of the proposed development who would also benefit from being in close proximity to public open spaces. This would be appropriate in the context of Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.
- 2.4 Although the development of the site would result in slight harm through the loss of an undeveloped area of land within the town and some loss of landscaping and habitat at the site contrary to Policies CS11, CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy, this can be mitigated through on site landscaping works. The benefits of new residential development, in this instance would significantly and demonstrably out-weigh this very limited harm to the area in accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 The site is located on the eastern side of Glendale, Hemel Hempstead and comprises an area of open land between numbers 10 and 14 Glendale. This site is covered in a number of trees protected under a Tree Preservation Order. There is a footpath on the northern boundary of the site providing a pedestrian link between Glendale and Sunnyhill Road.
- 3.2 There are a number of different types of property within Glendale including townhouses, semi-detached and detached properties which contribute to the varied character and appearance of the locality.

4. PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a single five bed family dwelling at the above address. The proposed property would be a detached townhouse and would include accommodation over four floors including within the roof space.
- 4.2 The proposals will retain a footpath link between Glendale and Sunnyhill Road adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. A total of three off-street parking spaces would be provided to the front of the property.
- 4.3 A modest garden terrace would be created to the rear of the dwelling and accessed via bedroom 2 at first floor level. This would be some 2.4m in depth and some 7m in width. A retaining wall, approximately 1.7m in height, would be located at the eastern edge of the terrace beyond which land would continue to slope upwards for a further 6m to properties at Sunnyhill Road. The applicant has confirmed that this upper garden level would need to be accessed via steps from the terrace section.
- 4.4. Additional land is owned by the applicant to the south of the proposed dwelling and adjacent to 10 Glendale.

5 PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.1 This site has an extensive planning history relating to the protection and works to a number of trees thereon. The current application follows permission for the removal of two trees (T3 and T4) covered by TPO on the applications site under references 20/01290/TPO and 20/02035/TPO. The felling of T3 and T4 was granted subject to the planting of replacement trees at the application site.
- 5.2 A number of subsequent applications have been submitted for the construction of residential development on the site including 20/01262/FUL (Withdrawn) 20/01263/FUL (Withdrawn) and planning application 20/03921/FUL (Refused)
- 5.3 Planning permission 20/03921/FUL for the construction of a pair of three bed semi-detached dwellings was refused on the 10th February 2021 for the following reasons:
 - 1. The proposed development, in view of its site coverage, its relationship to existing landscaping feature and protected trees, inadequate amenity space and substandard arrangements for parking and access is considered to result in an overdevelopment of this site and poor quality residential scheme contrary to Policies CS8, CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 51, 54, 58 and 99 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011 and Car Parking Standards SPD (November 2020) and
 - 2. The proposed development would not have an appropriate relationship to preserved trees upon the application site and is likely to result in significant harm to the health and amenity value of landscaping in this location both directly as a result of development and in the long term in view of the juxtaposition between the building and trees. This would be detrimental to the health, amenity and ecological value of the tree contrary to Policies CS12, CS13 and CS26 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan 1991-2011. In the event of the removal of trees in the locality, this is likely to result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Core Strategy

- 5.4 Replacement trees as required by applications 20/01290/TPO and 20/02035/TPO were planted in September 2021. These trees are replacement European Beech trees some 3m and 3.5m in height in accordance with the approved details.

6. PLANNING POLICIES

6.1 National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2021) (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

6.2 Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS2 – Selection of Development Sites
CS8 – Sustainable Transport
CS11 – Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS13 – Quality of Public Realm
CS17 – New Housing
CS26 – Green Infrastructure
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction
CS31 – Water Management
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS35 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Area Based Policies SPG (2004)
Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)
Energy Efficiency and Conservation
Water Conservation

7. REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Consultation responses

These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

7.2 Neighbour notification/site notice responses

These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of Development

- 8.1 The application site is located within a residential area where in accordance with Policies NP1, CS1, CS2 and CS4 there would be no objection in principle to appropriate residential development. The provision of a new dwelling in this location would make a small contribution towards the housing target in Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.2 Given the lack of a five year housing land supply within the Borough any proposal for residential development should be considered favourably under paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) unless it would result in significant and demonstrable adverse impacts that would outweigh the benefits of development when assessed against the NPPF as a whole. In this case the planning balance weighs in favour

of the grant of planning permission given the limited harm that can be identified to result from development by reason of its impact on trees and amenity and given the significant demand for housing within the Borough.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

- 8.3 The proposed development is considered to be appropriate in terms of its design, bulk, scale, height, site coverage and appearance. A footpath would be retained between the proposed building and its northern boundary allowing for access to the rear of the application property together with neighbouring units in Glendale and Sunnyhill Road. This will help the property to be read in the context of the small terraces of townhouse to the north of the site and will result in a development that is neither incongruous nor harmful to the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.4 The layout of the proposed development allows for the formation of an appropriate area of off-street car parking to the front of the dwelling whilst there would also be a modest rear terrace accessible to the rear of the property and from bedroom 2. A remaining area of land to the rear of the property could be used as a terraced garden, however it is not clear from the submitted plans how this may be accessed. The applicant has confirmed that this would need to be accessed via steps from the terraced area, the details of which would need to be secured by condition. The external amenity space, though limited in function is still considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policy CS12 and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Glendale

- 8.5 The proposed dwelling will only have a direct impact upon the residential amenities of 14 Glendale on the northern boundary of the application site. There are three windows within the flank elevation of this property directly looking onto the application site and a number of windows within the rear elevation of the property beyond which the proposed dwelling would extend. The proposed development does not breach a 45 degree angle to the windows within the rear elevation of this property and as such there would be no substantial loss in either daylight or sunlight thereto. The three windows within the flank elevation of this property would be secondary windows and have historically been in the shadow of tall trees upon the application site. I do not consider that any loss of light in this instance would be significant nor justify the refusal of planning permission in this case.

Sunnyhill Road

- 8.6 The proposed dwelling would be located approximately 27m from the rear elevation of properties in Sunnyhill Road and would be located at a lower level to these residential units. As such I am satisfied that the proposed dwellings would neither be overlooked at this distance by those properties nor would result in the overlooking of such properties such that there would be any significant impact on the privacy. Given the juxtaposition between properties I am also satisfied that there would be no significant impact on daylight or sunlight to the properties in Sunnyhill Road.

Impact on Trees

- 8.6 Many of the objections to this scheme focus on the removal of preserved trees from the application site and the formation of the 'development plot' in which the dwelling is now proposed. Permission was granted for the removal of trees T3 and T4 from the site given

evidence that these trees were dying. There is no evidence to suggest that the applicant caused damage to the trees despite the allegations of a number of parties. This should not prejudice the determination of this case on the planning merits.

- 8.7 The determination of this case has been substantially delayed to understand the precise implications of the development upon the trees at the site. In addition, officers have declined to determine the case, whilst the requirements for replacement tree planting have remained outstanding and subject to potential enforcement action. The applicants have provided additional details as to how the proposed dwelling would be constructed on a raft foundation whilst detailed comments have been requested from the Trees and Woodlands officer (See Appendix A).
- 8.8 The preserved trees have been replaced in accordance with the conditions to the TPO consents and in a location agreed by the applicants and the Trees and Woodlands section. The distance between the proposed dwelling and the trees (T3 and T4) has also been increased since the previous refusal of planning permission by some 1.3-1.5m following a reduction in footprint to the building and the number of dwellings proposed. Although further tree removal is proposed as part of this application, the tree removed immediately to the rear of the proposal is not considered to have significant amenity value nor would it appear subject to the current TPO on the site. As such we cannot object to its removal under Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan 1991-2011. The remaining trees at the rear of the site are indicated to be retained during the course of the development.
- 8.9 It therefore falls to the local planning authority to consider whether the proposed building can be constructed without damaging the existing trees upon the site including the replacement trees for T3 and T4, whether the proposals would inhibit the growth of these trees to a reasonable maturity and/or whether the proposed dwelling would have a satisfactory relationship to remaining trees upon the site either protected or otherwise.

Direct Damage

- 8.10 The Trees and Woodlands section have confirmed that it is possible to construct the proposed dwelling without causing direct damage to the trees and their roots in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan 1991-2011. The proposals will utilise a shallow raft foundation design to minimise damage to the roots of the trees.

Impact on Residential Amenities of Future Owners

- 8.11 The relationship between the trees and the residential unit has been carefully considered in terms of the impact of the trees upon the living conditions of future occupants. The layout of the proposed dwelling is such that the main living areas rely on an outlook towards Glendale Road with bedrooms and secondary accommodation backing onto the treed areas to the eastern and southern boundaries of the site. This layout should minimise any demand for pruning of the trees to provide daylight and sunlight to the dwelling with the general acceptance that trees in this location will inevitably provide shade to the rear of the building. I am satisfied that the extent of glazing within the front and rear elevation should provide sufficient daylight to the rooms served. The depth of the property will inhibit daylight to the kitchen/dining area of the proposed dwelling and as such it might be beneficial to introduce a row of high level windows within the flank (south) elevation to improve overall light levels to these main habitable areas. Such windows could be introduced without any significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring units.

Future Management and Growth

- 8.12 The preservation of trees through a TPO does not prevent the reasonable pruning and regular maintenance of trees to maintain an appropriate relationship to residential units and such applications would need to be judged upon their merits. I do however note that the quality of preserved trees at the rear of the site is relatively poor and that they may have limited life in such circumstances. There is little evidence in this case to suggest that such requirements for pruning would significantly increase as a result of residential development nor should be prejudicial to the short term health of significant trees on site. In such circumstances, I conclude that it is difficult to object to the relationship between the property and mature trees in this case.
- 8.13 The ability of replacement trees T3 and T4 to reach full maturity as a result of development may be reduced given the location of the property however given the tree species should require relatively little maintenance and grow to have an attractive form, there is no reason to suggest that the trees will not continue to contribute to the visual amenity of the area in the longer term.
- 8.14 It is considered that the any harm to the trees at the site would be clearly outweighed by the benefits of residential development in this instance and having regard to the tests at paragraph 11 of the NPPF. It is noted that the Trees and Woodlands officer's doubts that the trees on the site would meet current criteria for the designation of Tree Preservation Orders.

Impact on Highways Safety

- 8.15 The development would result in the creation of a large area of hardstanding and the need for a dropped kerb to be installed to the front of the property. This parking area would provide three car parking spaces for the dwelling in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020). Parking spaces should be provided with EV charging infrastructure in accordance with the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020) and additional details should be secured by planning condition
- 8.16 The proposed parking spaces would be constructed in block paving and would be similar in appearance to a number of neighbouring parking areas serving townhouses within Glendale. The property is close to the end of the cul-de-sac where there are limited vehicle movements whilst the majority of residents would also appear to reverse onto the public highway without significant harm to highways safety. I find no reason to conclude otherwise in relation to the application site. This is not considered to be significantly harmful to matters of highways safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)
- 8.17 The construction of the proposed parking area will result in the formation of a dropped kerb to access the site with an associated reduction in on-street parking for neighbouring properties. The site is located opposite a turning head for the highway and it is considered that the parking of vehicles in this location significantly impedes access and circulation space within the cul-de-sac. As such, it is considered that the removal of on-street parking in this location would be beneficial to matters of highways safety and as such there is no objection to the formation of the drop kerb in this location and to the displacement of any on-street parking in this instance.

Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

- 8.18 All new development is expected to contribute to the provision of on-site, local and strategic infrastructure required to support the development in accordance with Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy. The site would comprise residential development and would be liable for the

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as set out within the Council's adopted Charging Schedule. A charge of £100 per square metre (increased by indexation) would be levied against new residential development in this location. The development will not be expected to make any other contributions towards the cost of infrastructure in accordance with Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy.

Other Matters

Bats

- 8.19 The application site was surveyed by an Ecologist in July 2020 who concluded that a number of trees at the site had a moderate bat roost potential. These include two Beech trees (T2 and T9) and several Sycamore trees (T3-T8 and T10-T12). The remaining trees on the site were considered to have a negligible or low potential as roosting habitat including T1 (removed as a result of the TPO) and T15 (required to be removed to facilitate the creation of off street parking).
- 8.20 The trees identified as T1 and T2 in then ecology report (Beech trees) have been felled in the period since this report. These trees are shown as T3 and T4 from the TPO and have been replaced in accordance with the approved TPO works. It appears likely that further trees (T3 in the ecology report and tree Z7 on the TPO and tree Z16) may be felled in the short-medium term given its proximity to the rear of the proposed dwelling and this tree would also appear to have some moderate potential as a bat roost.
- 8.21 The report indicates that the remaining trees are to be retained including those on the northern and eastern extremities of the site. The bat report suggests that the development can proceed with mitigation and suggests that mitigation in the form of bat boxes be added to several mature trees upon the eastern boundary.
- 8.22 Given the age of the ecological report and the change in condition of the site, this survey is worth repeating prior to the commencement of works alongside additional surveys necessary for a bat licence to be secured from Natural England. Appropriate works and mitigation measures should be conditioned in accordance with Policy CS26 of the Core Strategy.

Sustainable Construction

- 8.23 Sustainable building design and construction is an essential part of the Council's response to the challenges of climate change, natural resource depletion, habitat loss and wider environmental and social issues. The application is not accompanied by a Sustainability Statement that addresses the specific requirements of Policies CS29, CS31 and CS32 and as such there is a need to seek additional information via a planning condition.

Response to Neighbours.

- 8.24 The comment of neighbouring parties have been addressed above with the exception of the following matters:

Use of the Premises as a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO)

- 8.25 The application seeks planning permission for a single family dwelling as described within the application form and associated Design and Access Statement. However a number of residents have queried the internal layout of the property and whether the intention is to use the property as a HMO. Planning permission would not be required to change the use of an individual residential property to a 6-bed HMO but such uses are heavily regulated by the Environmental Health team. The use of a property as a larger HMO may result in a material

change in use of an application property and would bring with it a number of specific planning issues including those of noise and parking which would require further consideration.

- 8.26 It is worth noting that the use of the property as a HMO is likely to require a similar level of off-street parking to a six bed dwelling as set out within the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)¹ and as such need not raise additional parking and access concerns.

Impact on Footpath

- 8.27 A number of residents have expressed concern that the proposed development would be built over land containing a pathway linking Glendale with Sunnyhill Road and providing access to a number of rear gardens. The path is not a Public Right of Way and nor would it be obstructed by the development in its current form. It does however appear to be located within the application site and as such further information is required to demonstrate that it would be retained for wider public benefit.

Conditions

- 8.28 Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only used where they satisfy tests that they are necessary, relevant to planning and the development to be permitted, reasonable, precise and enforceable.
- 8.29 The Conditions identified within the report and set out below are considered to be meet the relevant tests for the imposition of planning conditions. Given the constraints of the site, it is also considered reasonable to removed rights to extend the house, construct porches and outbuildings both to ensure that parking spaces remain available for future use by residents and to ensure the appropriate relationship to trees on the site.

9 CONCLUSIONS

- 9.1 The construction of a new residential unit within this area of Hemel Hempstead would support the delivery of the housing target in accordance with Policies CS1, CS2 and CS17 of the Core Strategy.
- 9.2 The proposed dwelling is considered to constitute an acceptable form of development that would not result in any significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties nor highways safety in accordance with Policies CS8, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011 and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)
- 9.3 An appropriate level of residential amenity would be provided for future occupants of the proposed development who would also benefit from being in close proximity to public open spaces. This would be appropriate in the context of Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.
- 9.4 Although the development of the site would result in slight harm through the loss of an undeveloped area of land within the town and some loss of landscaping and habitat at the site contrary to Policies CS11, CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy, this can be mitigated through on site landscaping works. The benefits of new residential development, in this instance would significantly and demonstrably out-weigh this very limited harm to the area in accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

¹ The Car Parking Standards SPD (2020) requires the provision of 0.5 spaces per bedroom for a HMO in Zone 3.

10 RECOMMENDATION

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

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

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

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

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

Plans

**SK-002 Revision B (Location Plan)
P030 Revision B (Proposed Site Plan)
P130 (Basement and Ground Floor Plan)
P131 (First and Second Floor Plan)
P230 (Front and Rear Elevation)
P231 (Side Elevation and Section)
P232 (Street Scene)
5135.S01 (Foundation Design)
5135.S02 (Foundation Design)
5135.S03 (Foundation Design)**

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

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

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

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

- all external hard surfaces within the site;
- other surfacing materials;
- means of enclosure;
- details of existing and proposed site levels;
- means of access to the upper garden level and any retaining structures;
- details of bin storage facilities;

- details of all trees to be retained and the measures for their protection for the duration of construction;
- ecological mitigation measures; and
- soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs.

All tree protection measures shall be erected prior to the commencement of development and shall thereafter be retained for the duration of construction.

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. **No construction of the superstructure shall take place until suitable ecological surveys of the site and a survey of trees has been provided to establish the bat roosting potential of any trees upon the site and in particular any trees to be removed from the site and where appropriate any mitigation measures. The development shall not commence until full details of any mitigation measures including the siting and design of any bat boxes and a timetable for their erection shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.**

The development shall not be occupied until the mitigation measures have been provided fully in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity and in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy (2013)

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

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

7. **The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the proposed access and circulation areas have been provided fully in accordance with approved plan P30 Revision B (Proposed Site Plan)**

Reason: To ensure that adequate arrangements are made for parking and access to the application site in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

8. **The development hereby approved shall not be constructed until full details of any pedestrian access between Glendale and properties at Sunnyhill Road have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include details of the levels, width and surfacing of any path.**

The pedestrian access shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details and shall be free from obstruction to members of the public.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian safety and sustainability in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

9. **No construction of the superstructure shall take place until details of electric vehicle charging points and associated infrastructure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until the electric vehicle charging points and infrastructure has been provided fully in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the sustainable development of the site in accordance with the aims of Policies CS8, CS28 and CS29 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), the Sustainable

10. **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 1995 (As Amended) or any revisions thereto there shall be no development falling within the following schedules to the specified units without the express planning permission of the local planning authority**

Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A, B and E.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and residential amenity in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

INFORMATIVE

ARTICLE 35

CONTAMINATION

1. In the event that ground contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority with all works temporarily suspended until a remediation method statement has been agreed. This is because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.

2. Materials or conditions that may be encountered at the site and which could indicate the presence of contamination include, but are not limited to:

Soils that are malodorous, for example a fuel odour or solvent-type odour, discoloured soils, soils containing man-made objects such as paint cans, oil/chemical drums, vehicle or machinery parts etc., or fragments of asbestos or potentially asbestos containing materials. If any other material is encountered that causes doubt, or which is significantly different from the expected ground conditions advice should be sought.

HIGHWAYS:

1. Extent of Highway:

Information on obtaining the extent of public highway around the site can be obtained from the HCC website:

www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/extent-of-highways.aspx

2. Storage of materials:

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

3. Obstruction of public highway land:

It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence.

4. Road Deposits:

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

5. Dropped Kerbs

It is an offence under the highway act 1980 to mount the kerb to reach a parking space. Therefore, a dropped kerb is required to facilitate said action from the highway network.

6. Construction standards for 278 works within the highway:

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.

WATER

1. The proposed development is located within 15 metres of Thames Waters underground assets and as such, the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings are in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk Phone: 0800 009 3921

(Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm) Write to: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Hertfordshire Highways	<p>The proposal is for the construction of a one 5 bedroom detached town house on land adjacent to 10 Glendale, Hemel Hempstead. Glendale is a dead-end 30 mph unclassified local access route that is a highway maintainable at public expense. This is an interim response owing to the lack of detail presented regarding how the three new parking spaces will be accessed via the highway network.</p> <p>The application form states that there will be no new access onto the highway network. However, the current location does not have an existing dropped kerb.</p> <p>It is an offence under the highway act 1980 to mount the kerb to reach a parking space. Therefore, a dropped kerb is required to facilitate said action from the highway network. HCC Highways recognises that the adjacent properties are characterised by 7.2 metre (6 dropped kerbs and 2 risers) dropped kerbs which would be deemed acceptable in this instance too. The proposed property location and access onto the highway network is currently fronted by a light column and box, these will need to be removed for the development to take place which must be illustrated on drawings and will be at the applicants cost. All relocation of highways items will have to be agreed by the relevant parties.</p> <p>Therefore, for HCC highways to make an informed decision we would like to see the location and size of the proposed dropped kerb onto the highway network in relation to the 3 parking spaces and the current and relocated positions of the light column and box. Once, this is provided to HCC Highways, we can make an informed recommendation to the LPA in relation to highway matters.</p>
Contaminated Land Officer	<p>The historical land use of the application site is such that there is no expectation of the presence of ground contamination and as such there is no objection to the application and no requirement for land contamination planning conditions. However, because the proposed development is for the introduction of a residential end use it is recommended that the following informatives are included in the decision notice.</p> <p><u>Contaminated Land Informative 1:</u></p> <p>In the event that ground contamination is found at any time when</p>

	<p>carrying out the approved development it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority with all works temporarily suspended until a remediation method statement has been agreed. This is because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.</p> <p><u>Contaminated Land Informative 2:</u></p> <p>Materials or conditions that may be encountered at the site and which could indicate the presence of contamination include, but are not limited to:</p> <p>Soils that are malodorous, for example a fuel odour or solvent-type odour, discoloured soils, soils containing man-made objects such as paint cans, oil/chemical drums, vehicle or machinery parts etc., or fragments of asbestos or potentially asbestos containing materials. If any other material is encountered that causes doubt, or which is significantly different from the expected ground conditions advice should be sought.</p>
Environmental Health	<p>The site is outside transportation significance noise contours and also outside of the AQ Mgt Zone. Due to the relatively small size of the development I do not consider it will negatively impact on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>I therefore do not have any objections to the application or make any further comment.</p>
Trees and Woodlands	<p>Thank you for your questions in relation to this proposal. I would make the following comments:</p> <p>a) With appropriate protection measures, the proposed dwelling could be built without resulting in tree harm.</p> <p>b) There will be a demand for the pruning of site trees at some point in the future. The two new trees are closer to buildings (proposed and existing) than the mature trees are, located towards the rear of the site, so it's foreseeable that they will require more pruning throughout their lives. However, the mature trees have never existed within a garden setting before, and this will bring different pruning pressures. The reasonable pruning of TPO trees is allowed.</p> <p>c) New and existing trees will cast shade across the proposed dwelling and its garden. Although there's no right to light in respect of trees / tree growth, it is clear that retention will affect the amenity of future occupants. Whether this could be defined as 'poor' is tricky as that depends on the amount of tree growth and the personal views of the occupant.</p> <p>The matter of site trees being protected obviously adds a</p>

	<p>complication.</p> <p>It is clear that the mature TPO trees on site aren't of good quality and probably wouldn't have been assessed favourably against TPO criteria today.</p>
Thames Water	<p>Waste Comments</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection, however care needs to be taken when designing new networks to ensure they don't surcharge and cause flooding. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer networks.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable surface water strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection, however care needs to be taken when designing new networks to ensure they don't surcharge and cause flooding. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.</p> <p>With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Management of surface water from new developments should follow Policy SI 13 Sustainable drainage of the London Plan 2021. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services.</p> <p>There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-</p>

	<p>site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes.</p> <p>The proposed development is located within 15 metres of our underground waste water assets and as such we would like the following informative attached to any approval granted. “The proposed development is located within 15 metres of Thames Waters underground assets and as such, the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide ‘working near our assets’ to ensure your workings are in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you’re considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk Phone: 0800 009 3921 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm) Write to: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB</p> <p>Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.</p> <p>Water Comments</p> <p>With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Address	Comments
8 Glendale	<p>I object to the development of a 5 bedroom/10 person townhouse application 21/01712/FUL.</p> <p>The mass of the 5 bedroom/10 person townhouse development will be too overbearing if the tree planting required and footpath are to be maintained and kept in character with this wooded area of the Glendale cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The development must keep the convenience of the existing low gradient footpath between Glendale and Sunnyhill which provides access to the rear of existing houses and the Springfield allotments, local schools and shops.</p> <p>The 5 bedroom/10 person town house development is to be sited at</p>

	<p>the narrowest part of the Glendale cul-de-sac. Glendale is an already heavily developed area where on street parking is creating an obstructions on the sole pavement for pedestrians, prams and wheelchairs. The potential for a 10 person dwelling with their vehicles will make any remaining space impassable on or off the pavement.</p>
<p>14 Glendale</p>	<p>Objection to Application Ref: 21/01712/FUL</p> <p>I object because the application still does not have the required information, leaves a number of critical issues unaddressed, has an unacceptable adverse impact on neighbours, and attempts to overdevelop a tightly constrained location.</p> <p>I object because the application does not address comments made by The Trees and Woodlands Officer, Wednesday 10th February, about the long term issues with the site in respect of the dwelling / tree relationships. This is a sensitive location with a history of problems associated with the protected trees, so I object as it isn't possible to consider the application until implications for trees on the site are covered.</p> <p>I object because BS5837:2012 recommends steps should be taken to ensure trees are appropriately and successfully retained when a development takes place. It means that trees on site and / or within close proximity to an application have to be considered when making decisions on planning applications. The application does not provide this analysis.</p> <p>I object because the application does not take into account or provide for an issue also raised in responses to previous applications for the site that the TPO trees need to be given the scope and resources needed to provide the same public amenity as the TPO trees they replaced.</p> <p>I object because the council also specifies that such details as covered in BS5837:2012 be provided before with an application, and so omitting these means the application should be refused.</p> <p>In addition I also object because the scheme as proposed would extend further into the steep bank than existing properties do, ignoring the established building line, and so creating an overbearing and overshadowing impact on the neighbouring properties to the North. The Southern aspect of gardens to the North (No.14 onwards) is particularly important given existing levels of shade and blocking in the area.</p> <p>I object because the scheme will result in an unacceptable loss of light to several rooms in no.14 which has 3 windows that directly face the site.</p> <p>I object because the application also proposes to remove a number of parking spaces from Glendale, whilst simultaneously adding 5 more bedrooms and space for 10 occupants in an already tightly constrained cul-de-sac which already has awkward access at the</p>

	<p>Glenview end, and difficulties with parking.</p> <p>I object because the site constraints which remain unaddressed in the application, the various adverse impacts on the neighbours and limited spatial resources in the area mean this is an example of over development.</p>
15 Glendale	<p>I don't think there is sufficient parking provision for a 5 bedroom house. Is this application for an HMO?</p>
16 Glendale	<p>I OBJECT to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The proposed development will have a grossly overbearing impact on us and other neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The proposed large 4-storey structure will be erected in close proximity to the fence-line of number 14 Glendale (less than a meter away I would say). It will be set back from the adjacent houses and so will block a large portion of the southern aspect of 14, 16 and 18 Glendale (possibly even further down the row).</p> <p>Also, there will be 4 windows overlooking our garden, as well as the double-garden doors. This is because the proposed Ground Floor will in fact be on the same level as our First Floor as we don't have a Basement Floor (the same applies to all the other houses in the row).</p> <p>As a result of this, also the garden of the proposed development will start from about 2 or even 3 meters higher than all the other gardens in the row, creating an unbearable overbearing impact on us and other neighbours.</p> <p>2) Destruction of the existing tarmacked footpath leading from Glendale to Sunnyhill Road.</p> <p>The proposed development would be built directly on top of an existing, tarmacked and popular footpath leading from Glendale to Sunnyhill Road, which appears on Ordnance Survey maps and has existed for approximately 40 years. We regularly use this footpath to access Gravel Hill Allotments site, Spring Fields open space and shops off Warners End Road.</p> <p>The "footpath" that does appear on the plans (between the proposed house and number 14), seems to be the side garden-entrance for the proposed house rather than a genuine replacement footpath for the one that would be demolished by the proposed development. It doesn't show on the plans how it would connect to the rest of the right-of-way path, in fact it does not connect on the plans at all but just leads to their back garden. Even if it was to connect to the rest of the path running behind the gardens, it is very likely more large trees that currently grow there would need to be uprooted to accommodate this.</p> <p>3) Damage to amenity land, wildlife and TPO's.</p>

	<p>The plot for the proposed development has had, until recently, a few large trees that have been removed (in suspicious circumstances it has been said). Two of which had TPO status I believe, although other large trees had been cleared too.</p> <p>Even if replacement trees are planted where the plans show (should they not be planted first?), they will be hidden between the development and number 10 and will never have the same impact on what was once a lovely piece of amenity land that provided a habitat for bats, birds and other wildlife. Furthermore, the proposed development will clearly damage the remaining trees and wildlife on site, by the extensive levelling of the plot that would be required.</p> <p>It is also unclear from the plans how the replacement trees for T3 and T4 will fit between the proposed development and number 10, in fact they don't fit and clearly showing as such on the plans, and this is despite their canopies showing as significantly smaller than T3 and T4 which they are supposed to be replacing (so even if they did fit, it wouldn't be "like for like").</p> <p>4) Significant disturbance due to noise, vibration and blocked road access.</p> <p>The proposed development is likely to cause significant disturbance by noise and vibration to surrounding properties due to the extensive levelling and foundation work required. Also, it isn't clear how our cul-de-sac could remain open during the construction works given there would be lorries and other heavy machinery blocking road access.</p> <p>5) Exacerbating severe parking shortage on the cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The proposed development seems to potentially be a 5-units HMO given all the rooms are en-suite. This could very likely mean an extra 5+ cars whereas the plans only have space for 2 cars. There is currently a parking space issue already on Glendale, so much so, that a few months ago our bins could not be collected due to the lorry not being able to squeeze through the parked cars. The proposed development would exacerbate our already over parked cul-de-sac.</p>
18 Glendale	<p>As an immediate neighbour to the proposed development site, we believe this application will have a detrimental impact on existing local residents and the environment.</p> <p>The 'Design and Access Statement' document which supports this application contains multiple errors, missing information and typos, which doesn't provide confidence that the information contained within this application is correct e.g. the title page refers to the development of '2 houses' on 'Glendale Road', whereas this application is for 1 house on Glendale. Figure 6 side elevation shows two windows on the side of the property, whereas these windows are not present on the document 'PROPOSED_ELEVATIONS-1187561'. Table 3 Layout and dimensions doesn't include the dimensions for</p>

the third floor. You can work out the dimensions, however, the information supporting this application should be clear and accurate, which it is not.

Our objections to the application are the following:

Increase in traffic & loss of parking:

- There's already an issue with lack of parking in the area, resulting in cars parked along most of the available footpaths on Glendale (forcing pedestrians to walk in the road). This also causes issues for refuse vehicles trying to access the properties towards the cul-de-sac end of Glendale. The pathway in front of the development site is used by existing residents for parking, meaning these cars will be pushed elsewhere along the street.
- The turning head road access in front of the development site, is already used daily for parking by existing residents, highlighting the lack of parking on the road (See supporting photos). This would be made worse by removing existing parking in front of the development site and adding further cars for new residents.
- Most of the houses on Glendale are 3 - 4 bedroom, with anything from 2-3 cars per household, most of which require parking along Glendale.
- The proposed development contains 5 double bedrooms, which are all en-suite, with limited living space and no family bathroom. The overall sqm of the property is 214.2. 156.8 sqm of this consists of bedrooms and en-suites, with only 57.4 sqm on the ground floor for living space, which includes the hallway and toilet. The property looks like it has been designed with the intention to be used as a HMO, which will likely increase the number of people living in the property. The 'Design and Access Statement' states that the property is a '10 people family dwelling'. As a result, the two parking spaces included in the plan is totally inadequate, and will mean any additional cars at this address will need to park elsewhere in the street, where parking is already difficult. Added to this, the driveway for the property is approximately 4-5 meters wide which is not big enough to adequately fit two modern medium sized cars.

Further damage to the local environment & incorrect information on the plans:

- The development site will need significantly lowering and levelling off for the new foundations, which could damage the root systems of the existing trees on the site (Z7, Z8 & possibly T5).
- The pathway diversion as shown in fig 7 of the 'Design and Access Statement' document, will require the existing trees Z12 Z9 & possibly T5 to be removed so the pathway can run along the back of the property.
- In Section 5 of the 'Design and Access Statement' it states, 'The majority of trees within the survey area will be retained with two trees having been moved to a new position within the plot'. Two trees (with TPOs) were removed last year and have yet to be replaced so this information is incorrect. The remaining area around the proposed new property and the diverted pathway doesn't look large enough for the two replacement trees once they reach maturity.
- Due to the number of existing trees on the site and their proximity to the proposed development site, its highly likely the existing trees

will need to be removed to cater for the new property and the diversion of the existing pathway.

- Added to this, the suspicious nature and method in which the two protected trees (which previously obstructed development of this site) were damaged, doesn't provide any confidence that the existing trees and the overall environmental wellbeing of the proposed development site will be prioritised during any development.

- In our objections to the previous planning application for the same site* we mentioned that the tree 'T5' is not in the correct position according to the documents - 'PROPOSED_SITE_PLAN-1140774' and 'EXISTING_SITE_PLAN-1140771', and is actually much closer within the development footprint, most likely in the gardens of the new proposed property.

* The tree 'T5' is shown in a different position (compared with the documentation supporting previous planning applications) on both the DBC Planning Portal and the Legal TPO No. 1 document; Ref TPO/020 dated 5th September 1968. On these documents, T5 is shown within the footprint of the proposed development. This needs further investigation to clarify the exact position of this tree. If these documents are correct, I'm not sure how you can build the foundations for the proposed development without damaging the root systems of the existing trees.

Lack of open space on the development site - Garden space of the new properties:

- The proposed garden for the new development is very small and will contain several large, dense trees (see supporting photos). These trees will severely affect the level of natural light to the rear of the new property, and in all likelihood will need to be removed from the development site. This design is hardly ideal, and I suspect doesn't meet best practice in residential building design for this size of property. In particular look at the position of the trees Z7, Z8 & Z14, all of which will lean into the new property. It's also likely that the tree 'T5' falls within the garden footprint, as it is incorrectly positioned within the planning documents.

- This issue is the result of infilling a space which isn't suitable with the existing trees on the plot. This site originally contained multiple TPOs making it unsuitable to develop on. It's only now that two of the trees, which were directly in the way of the development footprint, have been conveniently damaged (resulting in their need for removal), that the site is now being considered for development.

Loss of privacy & closeness to adjoining properties:

- The dormer window at the rear of the property will overlook the existing properties at 11, 13, 15 and 17 Sunnyhill Road. From this window it's likely you'll be able to look into the garden plus all the windows at the rear of these properties.

- The development is planned to be built right up to the boundary of 14 Glendale, slightly set back in line with the property, 10 Glendale (which is further back than the existing properties from no. 10 onwards). This will result in the permanent and significant loss of privacy to all of the neighbouring gardens and properties at 14, 16 and 18 Glendale. The steepness of the gardens at the existing properties exacerbates this issue.

	<p>Loss of light & closeness to adjoining properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The position of the new development will significantly reduce the amount of natural light to 14 Glendale, and sunlight (particularly during the winter months when the sun is lower) to all of the gardens at 14, 16 and 18 Glendale. When we moved to Glendale, the survey stated this site included multiple TPOs, and as a result we never expected this site to be developed on, with the potential negative impact on the natural light to the rear of the property. <p>Existing prescriptive right of way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing prescriptive (tarmacked) footpath leading from Glendale to Sunnyhill Road has been used by local residents for approximately 40 years, and by us personally since 2011. I understand this is a private pathway, however, due to its long standing use as a prescriptive right of access, it should be retained along its current position. - The pathway provides maintenance access to the rear of the properties at 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, and 24 Glendale. Due to the steepness of the gardens at these properties, there is no access to the rear of the properties through the back garden (e.g. via a back gate). Losing this access will severely affect the ability of existing residents to maintain the rear of their properties. The alternative is for the gardens at all 6 properties to be altered, or for the residents to walk the length of three roads (Glendale, Glenview Road and Sunny Hill Road), to access the rear of their properties, which doesn't provide easy or practical access. - According to the supporting PDF document, 'PROPOSED_SITE_PLAN-1140774', the new position of the pathway runs through several trees (Z12, Z9, T5 and Z6). Some of these trees are very large (see supporting photos). As a result, I'm not sure how the path can be moved to this new position and be usable, without removing further trees from the site. - The conclusion section of the 'Design and Access statement' states.... 'This development increases the housing supply in the borough without damaging the natural assets'. We can't see how this development can be built without causing further damage to the existing trees and environment. The existing parking facilities are not adequate for current residents, let alone once you remove existing parking and add a further 10 residents to the street. The design of the property doesn't include adequate living or garden space for a family home (of 10), doesn't include a family bathroom, and the only internal access to the rear garden is through one of the bedrooms. This has not been designed as a family home and is highly likely to be used as a HMO. The likely environmental impact on the development site and the negative impact on existing residents, in our opinion, is not worth the addition of ONE house to the boroughs housing supply.
19 Glendale	<p>I would object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application states that the property is a 10 people 'family' dwelling. However, the plans show the property as featuring x5 double bedrooms, each with an en-suite. There is no 'family' bathroom shown on the plans and no 'family' access

	<p>to the small rear 'family' garden from the rear of the property, except via one of the proposed bedrooms. This would imply to me that the property is instead intended for use as an HMO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing property at 10 Glendale has in the past been used as an HMO by the developments applicant, Mr.Daniels. - The two parking spaces included in the plan would be totally inadequate. With up to 10 vehicles based upon a 10-person HMO at this address, many will need to park elsewhere in the street, where parking is already difficult. - Access to the proposed property & its x2 meagre parking spaces would also require installation of a drop kerb from the street, thus removing x2 parking spaces from use by neighbours, in a street where parking is tight. - Previous applications for the same site have seen subsequent tree reports show trees protected by TPOs to have been damaged/vandalised & the soil contaminated under somewhat suspicious circumstances, necessitating the tree to be felled. Subsequent Dacorum Planning Dept stipulations that the landowner should plant replacement trees and replace contaminated soil with new has been ignored. This work has not been carried out by the landowner. - The current right-of-way across the land, (which has been in-place for approx. 40 years) also serves as access to the rear gardens of the residents of 14,16,18,20 Glendale. The latest building application shows that the right-of-way will be moved. This will surely impact on access for residents of no's 14,16,18,20.
20 Glendale	<p>Firstly, the plan states there would be two allocated parking spaces for a 5 bed property which could result in 10 cars as it could be used as a shared house arrangement. Therefore, bringing 10 drivers to the road. There is not enough space for 10 new cars to be in the road and allow free flowing traffic, delivery drivers, and the dustbin men to get down the road. The road is already extremely congested with the current residences' vehicles as well as visitors and individuals who use the cul-de-sac as a turning around point during the school run. Therefore adding any more cars, let alone possibly 10 more would cause chaos.</p> <p>Secondly, the plan is misleading stating that trees are there when they are not, and claiming there is space for trees to grow. However, the house is drawn over these tress, and if these trees were able to grow around the house, I worry that the occupants would complain that the trees are blocking their light so would either cut them down again (which was an awful thing to do in the first place), or cut them back a lot, which would ruin the landscape and defeat the purpose of having the trees.</p>

	<p>Thirdly, the plans are confusing when it comes to the footpath. It looks as though the footpath would be moved and would only be accessible by the new occupants of the house. This would cause disruption for the residents as many of them use this footpath to go to the shops, work, school and the town center, including my family. If the footpath was restricted to residents only then air pollution is likely to increase as individuals who were previously walking will now be driving as it will be easier.</p> <p>Fourthly, there are concerns around where the construction workers are going to park, and keep their equipment. There have been problems in the past when the flat was built at the end of Glenview as it blocked the entrance to Glendale and caused delays to everyone's working and school life. As this house is being constructed in the narrowest part of the road I am concerned I will not be able to get to my home when I need to and leave on time, as well as the debris this new construction will leave behind, creating an unsightly atmosphere that I will have to live in. Coupled with this, emergency vehicles may also not be able to pass when needed by current residents.</p> <p>Moreover, it is unclear if the house is built in mind to be sold to one family or rented to 5-10 individuals. I think this should be made clearer so residents understand the implications of this building in more depth. Lastly, it was extremely disappointing that no one from the council informed us about this development, is it not a legal requirement? If a neighbour had not been aware and told other neighbours disruption may have been caused against many residents wishes.</p>
21 Glendale	<p>Comments: I object to the proposed development on the covenanted land adjacent to number 10 Glendale due to the following:</p> <p>Misleading application: The Existing Use section asks if the land is known to be contaminated. The applicant has stated 'no'. In his previous application 20/01262/FUL there is a tree report which clearly outlines contamination on site due to diesel fuel oil at the base of one of the trees with a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). This soil to be removed and replaced with Amsterdam soil according to decision notice 20/03021/DRC, but has not been removed to date. In addition, the previous application (20/01262/FUL) for this site had a comment from Dacorum Borough Council stating that: 'the application site is close to land with a contaminated land use history, metal fabrication works, and as such the possibility of ground contamination cannot be ruled out at this stage.' There were conditions placed on any works commencing prior to various conditions being met (namely a Phase I risk assessment to determine if a Phase II should take place). As soil removal has not been completed, nor are there any reports attached to state the risk assessment(s) have taken place, the applicant is incorrect to state that there is no contamination.</p> <p>The Planning application states UNKNOWN as to how they will deal with foul sewage, but states they will dispose of surface water via</p>

	<p>mains sewers. Has the applicant spoken to Affinity Water regarding their proposal to confirm either of these? It seems quite an important point as to how to deal with foul sewage and water drainage at a property.</p> <p>Misleading plans: The existing prescriptive right of way is next to 14 Glendale - not where it is shown on the map. The right of way - which is regularly used - has been in this position for the last 40 years. This provides the only access to the rear of some of the houses.</p> <p>Misleading plans: The plan of the site is misleading because all trees and vegetation have already been cleared. Existing site plans show TPO trees which have been taken out by the owner. These have not been replaced by March 2021 as required by previous applications, nor has the contaminated land been removed and replaced as yet. See page 6 of their design and access statement about moving the trees.</p> <p>In addition, if the council allows the replacement trees to be moved on the site to make room for the new property, this sends a message to other property owners that they can do what they like on a TPO tree and there will be no reprisals. It also makes the council seem as though they do not value TPOs.</p> <p>The space allowed in the current plan also does not seem large enough to support the trees covered by the TPO when they reach maturity.</p> <p>Parking issues: The plans show a house with 5 double, en suite bedrooms with a small living space and no loft or garage space. In addition, there are only 2 small car parking spaces. As this house is in a Zone 3 for parking, shouldn't there should be 3 spaces for a 4+ bedroom house, not 2 as in this application? Even so, this is woefully inadequate for the road as there is limited on street parking. In addition, by creating a house in this space, space where up to three cars which can currently park in front of the proposed site will be lost.</p> <p>The inclusion of 5 bedrooms, all en suite, in a house with no loft of garage suggests that the property is being built with the intention of being a house in multiple occupation (HMO). If so, then 2 car parking spaces is certainly inadequate.</p> <p>The occupants at number 14 will surely have issues with light restriction if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>This seems an overdevelopment of the site.</p>
22 Glendale	<p>Firstly, surprised that we did not receive a notification of this proposal (should not residents have received notification in writing?)</p> <p>MISLEADING PLANS: The existing prescriptive right of way is next to 14 Glendale - not where it is shown on the map. The right of way - which is regularly used - has been in this position for the last 40 years. This provides the only access to the rear of some of the</p>

houses. The proposed site plan includes a footpath which appears to lead only to the back of the development.

MISLEADING PLANS: The plan of the site is misleading because all trees and vegetation have already been cleared.

PARKING: Glendale has limited on street parking. Up to three cars can currently park in front of the proposed site which will be lost.

The plans do not include any garage space. Two parking spaces are included but these only seem large enough for very small cars (ie not SUVs etc).

The inclusion of five bedrooms (each with en suite) and the absence of loft and garage space in the plan suggest that the property is intended to be a house in multiple occupation (HMO). It is reasonable to assume that the occupants of the property may have five (or more) vehicles between them. The proposed small parking spaces will mean that most of the additional vehicles will have to park on the street

TREES: Decision notice 20/03021/DRC clearly implies that the replacement trees are put where the original trees were (ie the requirement that an area at least 3m square by 1.5m in depth around the replacement tree shall see all soil removed and replaced by Amsterdam soil to replace soil contaminated with diesel. Had the Council not agreed to the removal of the trees, their presence on the site would have been a major obstacle to the present development proposal. We are not suggesting that the owner of the land had anything to do with the vandalism of the trees covered by preservation orders. However the Council allowing the replacement trees to be moved around the site simply to make room for the new property would send a very worrying message about how seriously the council values Tree Preservation Orders.

The space allowed in the current plan does not seem large enough to support the trees covered by the TPOs when they reach maturity. A mature Beech can be expected to have a spread of up to 10m and a height of up to 40 metres. Therefore it is obvious that the replacement trees will either have to be repeatedly pruned, in order to artificially constrain them within the available space or more likely they will be removed before they reach maturity because of concerns for residents about safety, loss of light, falling leaves and debris blocking gutters etc which may be difficult for the Council to resist.

Moving the prescriptive right of way from where it currently is (next to 14 Glendale) to where it is shown on the maps would mean it was extremely close to existing and replacement trees requiring regular maintenance to keep the path clear and the risk of path damage from tree roots.

The plans do not cover the construction of the path. Clearly with a footpath so close to trees, it would be essential to ensure the tree roots are protected from compaction due to people using the footpath.

	<p>We consider that the proposed development represents an over development of the site, in view of factors such as lack of suitable off street parking (particularly as the development is clearly intended to be a HMO) lack of space for future occupants) and impact on the trees on the site.</p>
23 Glendale	<p>We write to object to the proposed 5-bed development next to 10 Glendale for the following reasons:</p> <p>The submitted drawings in the application seem not for a 5-bed family home as described in the application but, as others have commented, appear more in line with a 5-bedroom, 10-person House in Multiple Occupation.</p> <p>Parking is already becoming a significant problem in Glendale and neighbouring roads. A resident in Glenview Road parks outside our house every day and others park on the double yellow lines on the junction of Glenview Road and Glendale. In addition, the public grass area directly opposite the proposed development is often misused as parking. The kerbside in front of the proposed development is also already used for resident parking, this will no longer be available as it is part of the development.</p> <p>If the proposed development proceeds, there could be a further potential 10 cars attempting to park in Glendale. The plans only provide parking for two additional cars and the road is likely to be regularly blocked by double parking which is a relatively rare occurrence at the moment.</p> <p>Application no 20/01263/FUL was submitted to build a 4-bed semi attached to no 10 (since withdrawn). The land in that application now appears to form part of the application for this 5-bed detached house. It is not clear on the drawings how much of the land belongs to no 10 and proposed no 12. Will there be any restrictions on the development of the land between nos 10 and proposed 12?</p> <p>Finally, the drawings are annotated showing a 'footpath' but the drawing gives the impression that this is part of the land which will belong to no 12. If that is so, please advise of the position the footpath currently between 14 and the land proposed for no 12. The footpath is regularly used by residents living in Glendale and Cardy Road as a short cut to and from Sunnyhill Road.</p>
26 Glendale	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking - Parking on the road is already difficult as there is not enough room for current residents, this means the road is often bottle necked with residents parking illegally and dangerously. The construction of a small block of flats at the end of the road with not enough parking has made it so they are also now parking up Glendale this has made the already bad situation much worse. The construction made it so the waste collection lorries could not make it all the way down the road on 2 occasions, the addition of more houses and residents will make parking much worse. This could also stop access for emergency vehicles. 2. Assess to the road during construction - Adding to my previous point on parking during construction of the proposed properties there would need to be construction vehicles down the road constantly. This would block access to a large portion of the street and could be dangerous because it will restrict access for emergency service

	<p>vehicles. It would also stop residents being able to come in and out of their houses. Construction of the block of flats (64 Glenview) has shown the havoc it can cause as it made accessing the road difficult constantly causing residents of 26 Glendale and others to be late for work on many occasions.</p> <p>3. Footpath leading from Glendale to Sunnyhill Road - The existing footpath has been being used by residents for 40 years. It is noted that the footpath is on private land, however it is recognised as a right of access and should be maintained along its current line.</p> <p>4. Potentially HMO- This is likely to bring a lot more cars to the street causing issues with parking, further this type of property is out of character for the area and it has not been disclosed if this is the intention and is misleading.</p>
30 Glendale	<p>We wish to register an objection to this application.</p> <p>Firstly, we received no notification of this (should not residents have received one in writing?) and only learned of the proposal from a concerned neighbour.</p> <p>We have been residents of Glendale since 1980 when our house (No. 30) was built by Huntingates.</p> <p>Since that time there has been much encroachment on space in our narrow cul-de-sac, the latest being the construction of four flats at the entrance causing further congestion on a dangerous corner and restriction of sight up Sunnyhill Road for those exiting Glendale.</p> <p>Firstly, we would point out that confidence in any of the information or promises in this proposal is not helped when the title of the Design and Access Statement ("2 Houses on Glendale Road") is wrong and even the address incorrect ("10 Glendale Road").</p> <p>Our main objections are as follows:</p> <p>1. Right of way: When we first bought our house, we were informed that there was a right of way using the footpath from Glendale up to Sunnyhill Road. This right of way would appear to be threatened if this proposal is accepted. We have used this path for years both to go to the park and the shops at Warners End and, before we retired, also to go to work.</p> <p>2. Trees: A tree has already been badly cut down leaving unsightly stumps. Surely this should not have happened until the planning application had been considered and passed. It shows contempt for residents and an arrogant assumption that the proposal would be passed. The two tree condition reports by Abbots Arboricultural Advice (AAA) seem peculiar. The first one is dated 21st May 2020 on Page 1 but Pages 2 onwards have a date in the footer of 24th September 2019. The second report (Supplement) has a date of 24th February 2020. Whatever the confusion about dates, the second report contradicts the first in that the conclusions have changed from "minor decay" and "no significant loss of trunk structural integrity" to the decay being "significant" and the prognosis that the "tree will, over time, become structurally compromised such that it will need to be removed". It is unclear what period exactly</p>

"over time" indicates - surely this prognosis can be applied to any tree - but this is now a fait accompli since the tree has been destroyed. We would add that the report includes observations of "damage caused by an excavator bucket", "drilled holes" and a "strong smell of diesel oil". It seems highly unlikely that, as postulated, the diesel oil came from a storage tank since, as far as we know, all nearby residents have gas central heating. A likelier explanation is that persons unknown, and for purposes of financial gain, have deliberately damaged the tree and poisoned it so it would be condemned and removed in furtherance of this planning application. The suggestion that the serious damage to this tree could be due to "vandalism" is, frankly, preposterous - what vandals have access to excavator equipment with a bucket? We, and other residents of Glendale, do not want any more trees removed by such nefarious, possibly illegal, or any other, means. Lastly, the Design and Access Statement (Section 5: Landscape) refers to trees having been moved. We can see no evidence of this, only destruction of trees and unsightly stumps left. What was once a natural area of trees, shrubs and other plants now looks like a bomb site. This should not have happened in the arrogant assumption that planning permission would be granted.

Considering the very suspicious damage to the trees, granting this application could only be seen as rewarding extremely dubious and potentially illegal behaviour.

3. Road congestion: Our narrow cul-de-sac has a severe access and car parking problem which this proposal would exacerbate further. Several refuse collections have been missed due to the lorries being unable to enter the road and turn around. This is in no way the fault of the personnel collecting the waste. They generally provide an excellent service. Many of the households in Glendale have at least two cars, some have four. This means that most are forced to park on the road or pavement, sometimes completely blocking the latter for access by pedestrians or, even worse, those pushing children in a pram or buggy who then have to bypass parked cars by entering the road. This is a problem that was recognized several years ago by the majority of councillors at a public meeting (which we attended) about a previous building application on Sunnyhill Road which entailed parking access from Glendale. This application was turned down by Dacorum Borough Council but, as sadly often seems the case, upheld at an appeal in Bristol (120 miles from Hemel Hempstead and presumably designed to prevent local residents presenting their case). So much for local democracy! No current residents in the established town houses in Glendale use their garage for parking a car, they are too narrow for the majority of modern cars and especially for the popular SUV type of vehicle. Garages are invariably used for storage.

The ground floor plans for this proposal show no garage but two parking spaces on the drive. This proposal, unlike most "town house" designs, includes no garage at all. The plan showing two cars on the drive but it is likely that neither car would be able to open all their doors on both sides. The types of these cars are not specified and, unless these are unusually small cars, we would suggest that the

	<p>illustration is misleading, completely speculative, and bearing little, if any, connection to reality. In the event that these two cars are large, e.g. the SUV type, it is unlikely that both could park on the proposed drive meaning that one would be forced to park on the road or, more likely, across the pavement, inconveniencing and endangering pedestrians. If the household has more than two cars (quite likely with a 5-bedroom house), the problem is further compounded and, furthermore, by visitors' cars.</p> <p>We recognize that there is a nationwide housing shortage but are fed up with every available space in our town being filled in with unwanted, and unloved, building. We can remember a children's playground on nearby Beechfield Road being taken over for housing development. There was also the demolition of the old Anchor public house, also on Beechfield Road, with the site left in a terrible and dangerous state for years, presumably while some speculator waited for its value to increase. Other solutions to the housing shortage should be found, such as building on unattractive, fallow and unused farmland out of town, of which there is plenty. The complaints of "NIMBYs", who do not want anyone living within sight of their homes, should be ignored - in-filling in towns must cease.</p> <p>For all these reasons, we strongly object to this planning application and would urge it be rejected.</p>
34 Glendale	<p>We wish to register an objection to the planning application for land adjacent to 10, Glendale, Hemel Hempstead HP1 1TG.</p> <p>As residents of Glendale for many years, we were dismayed at the unexplained destruction of two mature beech trees on this site. One, in particular, was a magnificent, healthy specimen. These trees have not, as the plans submitted with the application suggest, been 'moved' within the site. They have been cut down and not replaced. Was permission for the removal of these protected trees lawfully sought and obtained, before they were removed? If not, then their destruction should not be allowed to facilitate yet another building site in Glendale.</p> <p>It is only recently that Glendale has been restored to peace, after some 18 months of building works that regularly disrupted and blocked the entrance to the cul-de-sac. The replacement of a single house with a block of flats, at the entrance to Glendale, has further added to parking problems and congestion in our cul-de-sac. Another five-bedroom house, for 10 people, could be reasonably expected to add another five cars. The plans appear to allow only two parking spaces with the proposed building.</p> <p>Is the right of way, consisting of a footpath between Glendale and Sunnyhill Road, protected by these plans? If not, why not?</p> <p>The proposal for a five-bedroom property on such a small site seems a classic example of attempting to maximise profit with little regard for the consequences. There would be very little outdoor space for the new occupants, insufficient parking, and the plans appear to</p>

	<p>compromise the rights of way enjoyed currently by Glendale residents. We have also lost two much-loved trees</p>
<p>40 Glendale</p>	<p>We would like to object to the latest proposal for development on this site for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Trees on the site have already been cut down under suspicious circumstances with numerous reports of vandalism to allow the TPO to be removed. The clearing of the trees before any planning permission was approved has left the plot unsightly and an eyesore on the road. I also understand that if a tree with a TPO is approved for removal then it must be replaced with another tree, have any trees been planted in the area? 2. Parking in the street is already limited and a mixed occupancy property would only add additional strain on this. The limited parking has often led to tight access, which on occasion has resulted in the refuse lorries being unable to access all houses on the street. Thank goodness on these occasions there have been no fires or medical emergencies as the emergency services would not be able to gain access. 3. A significant development on this plot would result in construction and trade vehicles causing access issues on the road. This was experienced recently when the flats were constructed at the beginning of the street and other houses opposite were having building work at the same time. In our household we have people who have shift work so require access out of the street at different hours of the day. One of our jobs it is vitally important to be punctual due to the nature of the job. <p>We hope that sense prevails and this latest proposal is rejected and the land is cleaned up with new trees planted to replace the ones that have been felled</p>
<p>42 Glendale</p>	<p>Very disappointed to hear a five bedroom house to be put in our road Parking is going to be crazy and make the road congested if emergency services needed to get into the road it would be impossible already the dustbin men have not been able to get into the road</p> <p>5 double rooms could result in a extra 10 cars needing to park where will they park</p> <p>Also trees were protected we have trees opposite us which block our light but they are protected so they stay so why have the trees been allowed to be moved for a house to be built??</p> <p>We also have jobs to get to every morning and will have lorries blocking the exit to get out of our road we are both key workers and can't afford to sit and wait for a lorry to move so we can get out to go to work</p> <p>Hoping this application will be denied as it will end up being a hazard</p>

<p>Highbanks, Glendale</p>	<p>Healthy trees with a TPO have already been cut down under, as already stated 'suspicious circumstances'. Surely this should not have been allowed before any building application is approved. Government guidance on TPOs states that 'anyone who contravenes an Order by damaging or carrying out work on a tree protected by an Order without getting permission from the local planning authority is guilty of an offence and may be fined.' One can only assume that the local planning authority approved this.</p> <p>There appears to be inadequate parking at the proposed development for what appears to be an HMO, which may well lead to up to ten additional cars. There is already a major parking problem in Glendale, with existing garages too small to accommodate today's often larger cars and the fact that most residents have two cars and some up to four. This causes many problems and, particularly following the recent development at the entrance to Glendale, parking congestion is so bad that the weekly bin collections are often compromised, with vehicles unable to gain access to Glendale.</p> <p>On the current plans, it is not clear whether there will still be access to Sunnyhill Road via the existing footpath, which is used by many residents.</p> <p>It is unclear from the application whether this is intended to be a home for one family or an HMO that would house 5-10 individuals, presumably each with their own cars.</p> <p>It is also unsatisfactory that we were not informed of this development application by the council, but instead heard about it via a neighbour. It appears that only two households were informed (Nos 8 & 14), thereby reducing the likelihood of many objections.</p> <p>We strongly object to this planning application and would urge you to reject it.</p>
<p>17 Sunnyhill Road</p>	<p>Comments: Regarding: Planning Application for one (1) five (5) bedroom detached house on the block of land adjacent to 10 GLENDALE, HP1 1TG - Reference 21/01712/FUL.</p> <p>I write to you regarding planning application reference 21/01712/FUL. I wish to submit my objection to the proposal to build one (1) new five (5) bedroom detached house on the block of land that directly backs onto my own property. Whilst I am very aware that there is a shortage of housing in the UK, and would normally be inclined to support a residential development, in this instance I cannot. The proposed planning application does not benefit the local community in any way, nor is it considerate or sympathetic to the natural environment. In fact, if approved, the additional housing will create an even more densely populated area, with little green space and further significant parking problems.</p> <p>I object to the proposed planning application based on the following material planning considerations:</p> <p>Loss of Light - My property is directly behind the proposed residential</p>

development. The bulk of my living space and garden amenity is North-Easterly facing. In the autumn and winter, dense trees already restrict the natural light on the block and the sun sits very low in the sky. As the proposed house is four (4) storeys high, including the basement and the attic (which will be a bedroom) and because the house is showing on the development plans as sitting further back on the block of land to Number 14, I will have a substantial loss of light for more than six (6) months of the year. This also means that any future owners / occupants of the house will have restricted natural light coming into the main living areas of the proposed house and the garden area, making the current design unacceptable.

Overlooking and Loss of Privacy - As my house sits higher up than the block of land on GLENDALE, I will completely overlook the proposed house, especially if the issue of the trees along my fence line is not appropriately addressed, which it has not been in the current planning application nor any of the other applications that have been submitted. If the trees along my fence line are removed during the potential building works, or if they are damaged during the building works causing them to have to be felled at a later date, then I will also be completely overlooked by the house. I will lose ALL of my own privacy. As the proposed house will be multi storeyed, the occupants will be able to see directly into my living room, garden and more worryingly into my bedroom, from the upper levels of the house, affording me no privacy at all. I am hugely concerned about this loss of privacy and ask that you give this consideration substantial weight when making a decision.

Trees - Yet again the applicant's proposal does not address all the trees that are situated on the block of land. The only trees that are addressed in detail are the trees they wish to remove in order to make the building of the proposed house possible (T3 and T4); both which are very mature, established trees. The replacement trees for those that have already been felled in spring / summer 2020 have not been replaced as previously required by Dacorum Council and already fall well outside of the specified time scale of October 2020 - MARCH 2021. With the proposed building work it is highly unlikely that these will even be replaced and planted within tree planting season this year, prolonging the growth of natural habitat for the local wildlife. The benefit and footprints of the trees already felled cannot be replaced by saplings that may not even survive and grow into mature trees.

Furthermore, even if the applicant replaces the felled trees as required by Dacorum Council there is no guarantee that these will not be damaged or removed when the landscaping of the block takes place, potentially at a later date, as the plans for landscaping are not shown on the planning application. It should be highlighted, that on the planning application it has been marked where the replacement trees will be planted for T3 and T4, in the space between 10 GLENDALE and the proposed house, however the applicant has previously submitted an application to build a further house in this position and given the positioning of this five (5) bedroom proposed house it is highly likely he will resubmit this application as he has done this once before - this means that there is

an even higher possibility that the felled TPO trees will not be replaced at all. The other trees that are addressed in the planning application are the ones that primarily afford the applicant privacy around his own home (T5 - T8). The remaining trees on the block, which provide myself and my neighbour's privacy (Z7 - Z14) are completely ignored and are not marked as "to be retained", though they are represented on the plans. These trees will also provide the potential future homeowner / occupants their own privacy. The applicant has also failed to address what measures will be taken to ensure that the root protection zone of the trees won't be damaged during any excavation, external or garden works to ensure the mature, established trees are protected and retained for years to come and will not require felling at a later date because they have been damaged by the construction work. Even the Bat Survey states that given the size of the proposed housing that it is unlikely the block will be able to support replacing the three (3) further trees that are marked to be felled, how are the replacement trees that are due to replace these meant to be able to survive and thrive!? The Bat Survey also further states that all retained trees should be protected from any damage during works with suitable fencing and conforming to British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction to maintain the integrity of the trees. The applicant has obviously had sight of this report yet there is nothing in the application that indicates that this will be adhered to and the trees roots and the trees will be suitably protected.

Nature Conservation - I note that a Bat Survey was carried out in JULY 2020 at the request of the Local Planning Authority. The report states that during a ground level tree assessment no evidence of bats was recorded. I would like to highlight that during spring / summer lockdown 2020 when the applicant cut down one of the existing mature trees outside of the advised time to fell trees (1st SEPTEMBER to 1st NOVEMBER annually) I discovered two (2) bats in my garden. I believe that this occurred as their natural habitat had been destroyed, at the time the only difference in the locality was the tree being cut down. I believe that the bats were Barbastelle Bats based on images sent to me by the Bat Conservation Trust. The Hertfordshire and Middlesex Bat Group have informed me that this species of bat is the rarest in the area. The Bat Survey states that the site is dominated by scattered trees and bare ground together with scattered scrub and sparse ruderal vegetation. It needs to be highlighted that the block has previously had very dense undergrowth but that the land was brutally cleared by the applicant last year after the other trees were felled on the presumption that their previous planning application would be approved. The Bat Survey makes a further reference to the trees that were previously felled, saying that they were negligible in what they could offer to the bats and that that a further two (2) trees are to be removed because of their current condition. What the Bat Survey fails to acknowledge or address is that these two (2) trees were previously healthy and magnificent specimens that have had their ivy growth removed by the applicant when clearing the block and it fails to address that one of the trees, which in fact has a TPO but is marked to be felled by the applicant, appears to have been damaged, likely in order to kill it. It does not benefit any of the other local residents to destroy the tree

and it is absolutely appalling and disgraceful that it has been suggested or implied that any other local resident or that a "random" person or a mysterious diesel storage tank may be responsible for this criminal act. The fact that twelve (12) of the trees on the block have "moderate" potential for roosting bats and that the bats are a protective species, Dacorum Council should be doing more to protect the trees on the block and ensure that they and their roots are not damaged in anyway if they decide to approve the building of this disproportionately large house. It is within Dacorum Councils "power" to stipulate that an appropriately qualified tree specialist be on site full time during the proposed construction work to protect the trees and their roots, especially during the excavation work and building of the structural work and the basement level of the proposed house. It appears that Dacorum Council is doing very little to ensure that the applicant is adhering to current requirements regarding the block and I and other local residents do not believe that they will be able to ensure that satisfactorily sized replacement trees are planted and that the recommendation for bat boxes to replace the loss of the moderate mature trees will be adhered too. The Bat Survey also specifically sets out for inspection of trees for bats and birds' nests if the felling of the trees takes place inside nesting season (MARCH - AUGUST). Given the previous disregard for the trees on the block and the vandalism that has occurred, what measures will Dacorum Council be putting in place to ensure that these specifications will be adhered too? How will this be policed along with the bat boxes being affixed to the remaining mature trees to replace the loss of habitat for the bats as detailed on the Bat Survey or is this simply left up to the applicant to comply with?

Traffic - The streets surrounding GLENDALE are already heavily congested with traffic, especially before and after school, as there are seven (7) schools in very close proximity to the proposed housing development. BEECHFIELD ROAD, GLENVIEW ROAD and SUNNYHILL ROAD, are all used to reach these schools; they are also roads that are used to reach Hemel Hempstead Town Centre, Warners End and the main roads that lead out of Hemel Hempstead and to other parts of Hertfordshire and the country. Building the proposed house will just cause further traffic problems. As it currently stands, SUNNYHILL ROAD and GLENVIEW ROAD are essentially reduced to single lane streets due to residents needing to park on the street as there is very little off street parking in the area. As GLENDALE is a cul-de-sac all vehicles exiting that street have no option but to turn onto one of the above mentioned roads. All vehicles entering GLENDALE will also have no choice but to come from one of the above mentioned streets. At this time there is a large housing development being carried out at the end of SUNNYHILL ROAD leading to MELSTED ROAD. This large housing development is due to carry on for a substantial amount of time and is already causing significant traffic and parking related problems on both SUNNYHILL ROAD and MELSTED ROAD. There are numerous large trucks / lorries using this road, blocking the road, being queued up on the road to deliver and remove building materials and reversing down the road at all times of the day. This causes delays to the local services and to other vehicles including local residents

being able to enter and exit SUNNYHILL ROAD and MELSTED ROAD. Having further building work taking place on an adjoining road with more trucks / lorries and associated workmen vehicles will only impact on this current problem even further. At this current time, and if there building work was to be approved by Dacorum Council for this house, if there was to be any kind of emergency on SUNNYHILL ROAD, MELSTED ROAD or GLENDALE it is highly unlikely that ANY emergency vehicle would be able to access the streets!

Adequacy of Car Parking - The Design and Access statement records that the proposed house is a five (5) double bedroom house for a family of ten (10). It is highly unlikely that a family that size will only have two (2) vehicles, they will likely have a substantial number of vehicles, even potentially up to ten (10) vehicles. The proposed planning for the house only includes parking for two (2) vehicles which means that there is a potential eight (8) vehicle parking deficit for the proposed house, this is a substantial number of vehicles that will need to be parked on GLENDALE and potentially the surrounding streets. GLENDALE already has limited on street parking and the surrounding streets are already overburdened with vehicles; to the point that vehicles are often unlawfully parked on footways and over driveways. Residents, including those with prams and young children, are often forced to walk on the road to get around these vehicles, compromising their own personal safety. If insufficient off-road parking spaces are provided for the proposed house, it is inevitable that this will also affect the residents of both GLENVIEW ROAD and SUNNYHILL ROAD. The vehicles involved in the potential construction work, along with the builder's vehicles will mean that the surrounding streets will be overstretched and this matter needs to be addressed so that the local residents are not further inconvenienced.

Foundations - A substantial amount of excavation will be needed for the proposed house foundations and basement level to be laid, due to the presence of multiple trees, combined with the recent removal of existing trees and the historical presence of trees on the block of land. The noise and vibration involved in this throughout the construction of the foundations would be unbearable. My bedroom is situated on ground level, at the back of my house, which backs onto the proposed building site. I work shifts and am sometimes required to sleep in the daytime; for me the potential noise and vibration would be unacceptable. If Dacorum Council are considering granting permission to build the house, then a non-impact method of foundation construction needs to be implemented, to minimise noise and vibration. The hours and days of construction should also be limited to allow the local residents affected by the construction respite from the constant building work that is likely to take a considerable amount of time.

Land Contamination - In the Application Plan, Part 14 the applicant has marked that there is no land which is known to be contaminated

and no land where contamination is suspected for all or part of the site. I believe that this is factually incorrect and that the applicant would be aware of this. The Tree Survey on the previous application for the block, which addresses the TPO tree that has been intentionally damaged, clearly stated that there was a strong smell of diesel coming from the TPO tree. It is unknown how much diesel may have been poured into the holes that were drilled in the tree in order to kill it and how much this may have contaminated the land or how long this was going on for prior to the destruction being identified. Because of this the applicant cannot state that the land is not contaminated, as in fact, part of the land, especially around the TPO tree is going to be contaminated. Sustainable Urban Drainage & Foul Sewage - In the planning application, it is stated that the surface water drainage will run from the proposed houses via mains drainage. The applicant has not provided details as to how the sustainable drainage will be implemented and how this will reduce the amount of surface water from leaving a block that is normally predominantly green or how the root zones of the TPO trees will not be affected. The applicant has also failed to address the matter of foul sewage and how this is proposed to be removed from the proposed development site without affecting the root zone of the trees protected by TPO'S.

Right of Way - The application does not really address the right of ways, in fact the footpath featured between the proposed house and Number 14 GLENDALE doesn't even look as though it allows access to residents along the back of the houses between GLENDALE and SUNNYHILL ROAD. This right of way is used daily by many local residents, including myself as it is a safer way to access both GLENDALE and GLENVIEW ROADS. On the proposed Street Elevation drawing greenery is shown between Number 14 and the proposed new house, this is where the current footpath is stipulated and is misleading and unclear as to how the right of way will be situated.

Insufficient Information / Incorrect Information - The paperwork for the application appears to have a number of errors and does not to address a number of considerable issues. None of the paperwork linked to the application to build the proposed house addresses the size of the "small garden access from the second bedroom", as it is referenced on the Design and Access statement. The Design and Access Statement states that the application is for two (2) houses on 10 GLENDALE ROAD, the building plans only show for one (1) house, admittedly one very large house that appears likely to be split into two (2) separate flats at a later date, which is not what is currently being applied. It is also highly likely the house will be used as a House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) property given the fact it is five (5) double bedrooms all with ensembles - no normal / average family would require this amount of space or bathrooms - this potentially means the area is even more densely populated and is not what is being applied for. The applicant has previously had a planning application rejected on the ground of overdevelopment among other things and it appears that this one (1) five (5) double

	<p>bedroom detached house is just as large as the two (2) previous semi-detached houses that planning application was sought for. What reassurance will be given to the local residents that the proposed house won't become a HMO or dual flat property at a later date? The Design and Access statement also flippantly states "We trust that the detail of the landscaping of the private gardens and access paths will be dealt with by condition on the consent", this is very presumptuous of the applicant that permission will be granted and still does not address many of the local residents' concerns that have now been raised on more than one occasion as to the Right of Way on the block and the protection and well-being of the mature and established trees on the block. The landscaping of the block, especially given the number of TPO trees on the block, is an issue that should be transparently addressed by the applicant at this planning stage. Given that the applicant is yet to replace the mature trees that have already been removed from the block within the time constraints given by Dacorum Council I believe it highly unlikely they will consider the best interest of the trees if left to their own devices, especially given the TPO tree that has already been intentionally damaged by "someone".</p> <p>Lastly, if Dacorum Council approves the building of this house, they are essentially passing a message to all home owners, building constructors, architects and anyone else involved in building in Hemel Hempstead and Hertfordshire, that TPO trees, wildlife and green spaces do not matter - trees can be cut down if they inconvenience your plans, just make sure you don't get caught destroying them in the process. Dacorum Council should not be rewarding this kind of destructive and inconsiderate behaviour.</p>
Anon	<p>We OPPOSE these plans so strongly,</p> <p>1) Destruction of environment, protected trees & wildlife.</p> <p>My previous objection letter, relating to the planning application for 2 houses on this plot (Ref 20/03921/FUL) gave specific details on our dismay to the plans regarding removing or damaging the protected trees & wildlife for this build. Whilst this detail is all still highly relevant, I don't think it's helpful to repeat myself word for word, instead I will apply my objection directly to the updated proposed site plans and how there is still NO specific clarification on several particularly important questions regarding the environment, trees and wildlife on this space.</p> <p>1A) Bat Report I understand this was requested by the council/planning authority as a result of complaints raised by neighbours and I regarding sightings of bats after a mature tree was taken down on this plot. Having read the report, I am concerned the conclusions and recommendations have not been considered and therefore are not reflected in the updated planning application. There is no specific reference to any of these in the application and when the topic on 'landscape' is raised it is very vague and non-committal, which I read as suspicious and believe the council should seek further clarity on the following points. - Included in the executive summary on page 2 of the Bat Report - it</p>

states - 'It is understood that two trees within the survey area will require removal due to their current condition, with the remaining trees to be retained and incorporated into the post development landscaping proposals.'

It goes on to reference in the recommendations section of the report – page 10 – 11 – 'It is understood all trees within the eastern extent of the site will be retained as part of the proposals. All retained trees should be protected from any damage during works with suitable fencing and all construction works taking place in the vicinity of retained trees should conform to British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction to maintain the integrity of the trees'.

I looked at the updated existing and proposed site plans, both of which give details of the trees on the plot, to check this was what was being proposed. However, it is painstakingly obvious that these plans have been generated inaccurately and are intentionally vague to mislead anyone who is not familiar with this plot and the landscape. There is a clear lack of information on the proposed plans of the trees labelled Z6 – Z15, with all other trees being included in a legend on the bottom of the page, giving specific detail to the tree and what the proposed intention is (I.e. T5 - Existing Beech Tree to retain, T4 - New Position of Existing Beech Tree etc), however all Z listed trees are just labelled 'Existing trees' with no detail or assurance that these trees are also planned to be retained. I find the wording intentionally vague and non-committal, giving the applicant free reign to fall back on this once the plans have been approved, to do as he wishes with these trees (Z6 – Z15) as no specific reference was ever made to retaining them. I would therefore request that the applicant is asked to specifically mention in writing, every tree on the site, and give details, such as has been done for trees T3 – T8, to comply with the bat report understanding and as such the final conclusions and recommendations.

Once this information has been provided, it is imperative that the answer is considered and measured against the recommendations of the Bat Report, to ensure that if the trees are planned on being retained, that they are heavily regulated and protected, to ensure the safe protection of the species and their roosts.

The report also states that if approved, there is a period in which the works can be carried out (September – November), as to mitigate disruption to wildlife, however, there have been no mention of this in the application and therefore it can be assumed this has not been taken into consideration. I would also ask who is responsible for ensuring this is regulated and not overturned by the contractors if the application is granted? As it is safe to say this additional work and inevitable incurred cost that comes with it, is not in their interest and therefore easy to ignore or 'forget'. There are also further investigations and licences that need to be considered based on timings and further findings, that need to be upheld by the contractor, but again none of this has been included in the documents provided and therefore there is no assurance this is a priority or even a part of the proposed plans.

Therefore, I would ask that the applicant is asked for more details on how they propose to follow these steps and what measures they will take to ensure the integrity and safety of the trees and species will be protected.

1B) Retained and Felled Trees.

As per my above point, the proposed site plans are suspiciously vague when it comes to trees and there is no clear clarification in the Design & Access Statement to confirm exactly what trees are to be retained, only illusive terms such as 'the majority of trees'. I do not believe this to be acceptable and would urge the council to push back for more precise clarification on all trees on the plot and guarantee they will be retained and protected under all circumstances. All too often these applications are passed and then 'accidental damage' occurs during the build, which inevitably leads to a decline in the tree's structural integrity, and they have to be felled for safety reasons. If this application is passed, I feel it is imperative that the correct measures are taken and regulated during the entire build to avoid this situation occurring.

I understand that the tree referenced as T1 in the Bat Report, has in fact been felled since this report was published, therefore I'd ask if this was done in line with the guidelines of the Bat Report and was it approved by the council beforehand? Also, I understand this to be the tree that had substantial damage and contamination to the roots – was there any investigatory work taken out by the council on this? Or has it been forgotten that the protected tree that would stop this entire build was coincidentally vandalised and compromised, enough so that it needed to be taken down, just in time for various applications submitted for building work on that plot? If this was not looked into, I think it's a very dangerous message the council is putting out to the community on how our local environment, wildlife and protected trees and species are treated in order to facilitate personal gain.

The proposed Location & Block Plans also show the residential plot outlined in red, with most of the mature tree's location on the other side of the public footpath (outlined in blue), which leads me to a complete loss as to why there is a requirement or benefit to ANY part to fell or damage any of these trees, when they do not encroach on any block plans. Not only are they mature beautiful trees that deserve to be respected, but they also provide enormous sound and privacy screening for all properties surrounding the plot, which I can only imagine would also be in the best interest of the buyer of the proposed new property too.

2) Loss of light – My property is behind the proposed residential development. I believe that the bulk of our living space and garden is North-Easterly facing. As the proposed houses are four storeys high, including the garages and the attics (which is proposed to be master bedrooms) and because the houses are showing on the development plans as sitting further back on the block of land, it's very clear that we will have a substantial loss of light for most of the

year. This also means that any future house owners will have restricted natural light coming into the main living areas of the proposed properties and the garden area, which leaves to say that the current designs do not work for all parties.

3) Overlooking and loss of privacy – Our house is higher on the hill than the block of land we back onto and therefore without the trees as a privacy screen, our living space and bedrooms will completely overlook the potential house. Therefore, if the trees along the fence line are removed during the potential building works, or if they are damaged during the building works causing them to be cut down at a later date, then I will also be overlooked by the house, especially from the living areas and bedrooms. We will lose all our own privacy. As the proposed houses will be multi storeyed, they will be able to see directly into my living room, garden and more worryingly into my bedroom, from the upper levels of the houses, affording me no privacy at all. I am overly concerned about this loss of privacy, for us and our neighbours, but also for the new house owners as I do not believe they will be able to understand this from the drawings themselves. This is a big concern and therefore I ask it is raised accordingly and given substantial consideration when making a decision.

4) Parking – Glendale has limited on street parking and the surrounding streets are already overburdened with vehicles, which often leads to vehicles being unlawfully parked on footways and over driveways. This causes residents often forced to walk on the road to get around these vehicles. The drawings show space for 2 cars, but these do not prove that they are big enough for large cars to fit, and therefore if insufficient off-road parking spaces are provided for the proposed housing development, it will inevitable also affect the residents of both Glenview Road and Sunnyhill Road. This is not to mention the vehicles involved in the potential construction work, will cause distress to all residents for an extended period.

I hope these concerns are considered, as if this application is approved without the appropriate measures or agreements in place, it will have a considerable negative impact on a currently happy community, all for the benefit of one individual. My biggest concern is also the lack of faith and belief in our own councils' motives, if they are seen to be in support of individuals who will go to great lengths to facilitate personal profit, with no consideration or care for the damage it leaves behind. If ignored, or worse supported, I strongly believe this behaviour will spread and we will find it impossible to protect the small pockets of green space we have left.