

ITEM NUMBER: 5c

21/02925/FUL	Change of use from Sui Generis to C3 residential. Construction of two pairs of semi detached dwellings comprising two four bedroom properties and two three bedroom properties.	
Site Address:	Land To R/O Wigginton Garage, Chesham Road, Wigginton, Hertfordshire, HP23 6EJ	
Applicant/Agent:	Mrs. Stella Potter	Rachel Wakelin
Case Officer:	Colin Lecart	
Parish/Ward:	Wigginton Parish Council	Aldbury & Wigginton
Referral to Committee:	Objection received from parish council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be GRANTED.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The application is considered to constitute limited infilling within a village and is therefore an appropriate form of development within the Green Belt. It would also not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the Chiltern Hills AONB, residential amenity or the safety and operation of the highway. A number of trees would be removed but these are all category C and U to which the tree officer had no objection to. The landscaping plans would ensure the development maintains a soft appearance and integrates with existing landscaping along the lane.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site comprises a former coach yard accessed from a lane known as 'The Bit' with some outbuildings located to the rear of number 5 Chesham Road. Number 5 Chesham Road comprises a former dwelling which was used as an office for the business and has now received planning (21/02912/FUL) permission for its extension and conversion into a residential dwelling.

3.2 The site is located within the village of Wigginton as well as the Green Belt and Chiltern Hills AONB. Dwelling types vary within the surrounding area within contrasting styles found on Chesham Road, The Bit and Field way. The site is set back from The Bit with existing landscaping defining its frontage.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The application seeks planning permission for a change of use from Sui Generis to C3 residential and the construction of two pairs of semi detached dwellings comprising two four bedroom properties and two three bedroom properties.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications:

21/02912/FUL - Change of use of the existing property from Sui Generis (garage and coach hire business) to residential. Demolition of large coach repair workshop to the rear and two storey side and rear extension.

GRA - 21st October 2021

4/00034/14/RET - Construction of fencing and gates
GRA - 18th February 2014

6. CONSTRAINTS

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: CAONB outside Dacorum
CIL Zone: CIL1
Former Land Use (Risk Zone):
Green Belt: Policy: CS5
Parish: Wigginton CP
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Red (10.7m)
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: RAF HALTON: DOTTED BLACK ZONE
Small Village: 4
Parking Standards: New Zone 3
EA Source Protection Zone: 3

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

Dacorum Core Strategy (2013)

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS5 – The Green Belt
CS6 – Small Villages within the Green Belt
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS17 – New Housing
CS24 – Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CS29 - Sustainability
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS35 – Developer Contributions

Local Plan (2004):

Policy 18 – The Size of New Dwellings
Policy 21 – Density of Residential Development

Policy 51 – Development and Transport Impacts
Policy 54 – Highway Design
Policy 97 – Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Policy 99 - Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands
Saved Appendix 3 – Layout and Design of Residential Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2020)
Planning Obligations (2011)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- The policy and principle justification for the proposal in terms of the Green Belt;
- The quality of design and impact on visual amenity and the AONB;
- The impact on residential amenity; and
- The impact on highway safety and car parking.
- Other material planning considerations (Trees and Landscaping, Landscaping, Ecology, Contamination etc).

Principle of Development

9.2 Paragraph 145 of the NPPF (2019) states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, a number of exceptions to this are listed, one of which being limited infilling in villages.

9.3 The application site is located within a Selected Small Village within the Green Belt where Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy (2013) states that limited infilling with affordable housing for local people will be permitted in selected small villages in the Green Belt, including Potten End and the application site.

9.4 The preamble to Policy CS6 states that infilling is defined as a form of development whereby buildings are proposed or constructed within a gap along a clearly identifiable built up frontage or within a group of buildings. The term 'limited' refers to development which does not create more than two extra dwellings. In this context the development does not fill a gap along a clearly identifiable frontage along The Bit and the quantum of development proposed exceeds two units.

9.5 However, it is noted that site does represent a gap between larger groupings of buildings in all directions, as it is located within the established village boundary.

9.6 In an appeal decision (APP/A1910/W/20/3251407) at 38 Rambling Way, Potten End, the inspector noted that the wording of Policy CS6 was more restrictive than the NPPF. However, as the Core Strategy predated the NPPF (2019) (now 2021), it was considered that more weight should be given to the Framework. When taking into account the less restrictive wording of the NPPF, the inspector considered that the development could be considered infilling as the site was bounded by development along Rambling Way and the Laurels, even though the site did not specifically form a gap in a built up frontage along a road, much like this site.

9.6 The site for this application is bounded on all sides by dwellings that front onto The Bit to the north, dwellings fronting onto Chesham Road to the east and those located on Field End Close to the west. Two residential properties are also located to the rear of the site to the south. With the above in mind, it is considered that the application can be considered to be infilling when taking into account the surrounding built form immediately adjacent the site and its location within a built up village.

9.7 The NPPF also does not specify a particular number of units in its definition of infilling. The application proposes 4 units which is above the 2 specified by Policy CS6. However, it is noted that at 38 Rambling Way mentioned above, 5 dwellings have now been approved under limited infilling. It is also noted that five dwellings have been granted on appeal at The Spice Village in Chipperfield under decision APP/A1910/W/19/3231097. From both these decisions it appears that an assessment on what is considered 'limited' has not been attached to a specific number of dwellings, but their resultant impact on character of the surrounding area with regards to its scale and massing.

9.8 It is considered that when the scheme is compared to its surrounding context, in terms of the built up form along The Bit, Field End Close and Chesham Road, it can be considered limited. The general form, scale and massing of the dwellings which would also be set back from The Bit would not be of a density which have a significant impact in terms of its assimilation with the pattern of development in the immediate area. In this sense, it is considered that the development is limited in nature.

9.9 With regards to the above, it is considered that the development constitutes limited infilling within the Green Belt and is therefore an appropriate form of development within this area.

Impact on Character of Area and Chiltern Hills AONB.

9.10 Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy states that on each site, development should integrate with the streetscape character and not result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Policy CS6 also states development within small village shall be sympathetic to its surroundings, including the adjoining countryside.

9.11 Policy CS24 of the Core Strategy state that the special qualities of the Chiltern Hills AONB shall be conserved. Policy 97 of the Local Plan (2004) states that any development proposal which would seriously detract from the beauty of the area will be refused.

9.12 The dwellings would not be prominently perceived from either Chesham Road or Field End Close. At most, the roofs would potentially be seen from some positions but these would not appear out of context given the built up nature of the area. The proposed dwellings would mainly be perceived from The Bit.

9.13 The density of the development would be approximately 18 dwellings per hectare and therefore broadly consistent with low density development that would typically be found in a semi-rural setting such as a village. Furthermore, when taking into account the variety in design, form and layout of properties found in the area, it is considered the development would be consistent with the pattern of development already found in the area. The development would be set back from The Bit and positioned to the rear of properties along Chesham Road. However, the two existing properties off Field Lane (to the south of the site) and the properties accessed off Wick Road further to the south are also aligned in this manner. The dwellings would there make use of a previously developed site while remaining sympathetic to the general pattern of development in the surrounding area.

9.14 The dwellings would measure approximately 8.8m in height and would be set back from The Bit by approximately 17-20m. As such, it is not considered that the dwellings would appear out of context with the scale of the other dwellings along The Bit. The submitted site section plan shows that the dwellings are of a height similar to nearby dwellings. The dwellings would not be prominent

when travelling up and down The Bit due to the set back and landscaped boundaries (Existing and proposed landscaping). They would mainly be perceived from directly outside the access.

9.15 The dwellings would be arranged as semi-detached pairs with spacing between them to appear sympathetic to the dwellings across the lane. Units 3 and 4 would be staggered slightly behind the build line of units 1 and 2 but this is not considered to be detrimental when taking into account the overall set back within the plot combined with newly introduced soft landscaping.

9.16 Both pairs of properties would have a symmetrical emphasis with moderately sized gabled front projections which would create depth and visual interest on the front elevations. They would also feature chimney stacks, brick headers and canopies to create architectural interest while retaining a pleasant symmetrical form. The garages would be moderately sized and would be positioned in a way where they would not be prominent from the road.

9.17 With regards to the Chiltern Hills AONB, the site is not greatly perceived from any long range views. As stated, it would mainly be perceived from standing in front of the access where the main context in terms of landscape would be the village setting. Within this built up setting, the proposed design and form of the development would integrate with the surrounding area. The nearest area of open countryside to the site would be that which is located to the east. However, from here, existing development along Chesham Road would screen the site. Therefore, it is considered the development would not have a wide ranging landscape impact in terms of the special qualities of the Chiltern Hills AONB and generally be sympathetic to the surrounding context.

9.18 As a result, it is considered the application complies with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS24 of the Core Strategy, as well as Policy 97 of the Local Plan and would not result in detrimental impacts to the character and appearance of the surrounding area or the special qualities of the Chiltern Hills AONB.

Impact on Residential Amenity

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

9.20 The proposed dwellings would be sited approximately 26m to the nearest dwelling on Field End Close and approximately 29m to the nearest property along Chesham Road, with intervening vegetation along the boundaries. They would also be positioned a significant distance away from the existing properties along The Bit. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of these properties.

9.21 The nearest property to the development would be Fieldfare, located to the rear of the site. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) does not contain any separation distance guidance in terms of a rear to side relationship such as that which would exist between the development and Fieldfare. However, units 1 and 2 would be positioned approximately 21m away from Fieldfare with units 3 and 4 being positioned approximately 16m away with the existing boundary trees being retained on this side of the site.

9.22 The proposed dwelling's would also all be positioned greater than 11.5m from the boundary with Fieldfare. When taking into account the 11.5m garden depth requirement under Saved Appendix 3, this would be a distance from the boundary which is regularly seen in built up areas of the Borough.

9.23 Therefore due to the distance of the proposed dwellings from Fieldware, combined with existing and proposed landscaping, it is considered that the development would not have an adverse impact

on the residential amenity of Fieldfare, or any of the other surrounding properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

9.24 All of the dwellings would have acceptably sized private gardens and acceptable levels of internal space. They would receive adequate sunlight/daylight and have acceptable levels of outlook.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.25 A transport assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal and finds that when comparing the sites existing (commercial use) to the proposed use, it is clear that the development proposal would result in a decrease of daily vehicular traffic from the site that would use the lane. The existing access from The Bit will be used to access the development.

9.26 Hertfordshire Highways have been consulted on the proposal and have not raised any objections, noting that the existing access is to be used, vehicular movements for the residential use would be lower than the previous commercial use, and that a fire appliance could enter and exit the site in a safe manner. A Construction Management Plan will be secured by condition should the application be granted. Adoption of the Bit by Hertfordshire Highways would be a matter separate from this planning application for the Highway Authority to consider.

9.27 It is accepted that the commercial use is no longer in operation. However, it is not considered unreasonable to base an assessment of the transport movements on the last known previous use that the site can legally be used for. It is also considered that the principle of a commercial use on site, depending on the individual operation, has been historically established. Concerns have been raised that the coaches have better visibility than ordinary vehicles due to their height. However, as stated above, the overall volume of vehicular movements from the site would be greater for the commercial use than the proposed use. While it is accepted ordinary vehicles would be of a lower height, a commercial use on site not necessarily involving coaches could in theory still occur. Furthermore the Highway Authority has not raised any safety concerns with regards to the access onto The Bit or the access from The Bit onto Chesham Road. The Bit is presently used by a number of existing properties for access.

9.28 with respect to parking, the scheme has now been amended to introduce additional parking and has also reduced the bedroom size of two of the units to 3 bedrooms. Therefore, the development comprises two 4 bedroom units and two 3 bedroom units whereby the parking requirement would be 10.5 spaces under the Parking Standards SPD (2020). The development would provide 11 spaces. It is noted that 4 of these would be located within garages. However, the dimensions of the garages meet the requirements of the Parking Standards SPD and therefore can be considered functional parking spaces in terms of this assessment.

9.29 The parking allocation shows that each 3 bedroom unit would have 2 spaces and each 4 bedroom unit would have 3 spaces. There would be an additional space for visitors. It is also considered that further visitors could potential park directly outside unit 3 if required. It is noted that some of the parking would be tandem parking spaces. The SPD states that this may be appropriate for spaces on-plot within the curtilage of the dwelling or commercial property if for use by the same property/dwelling and if an additional vehicle parking on the highway would not have unacceptable consequences.

9.30 Each tandem space is paired with another space serving the same unit. As also stated, the garages are of dimensions which meet the requirements of the SPD to be considered parking spaces. Therefore, this is considered acceptable. A condition will state that the garages are to be retained as car parking spaces and not to be converted into other uses.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.31 A number of trees and tree groupings will be removed to facilitate the development as well as for arboricultural reasons (poor quality). All of these trees are category C or U and the tree officer has confirmed that they agree with the assessment of these. As such, the tree officer has no objection to the removal of the trees indicated as well as the proposed landscaping plan.

9.32 8 new trees are proposed within the site as well as a number of new hedges and planting beds. Whilst tree coverage at the front of the site will be reduced compared to the existing situation, it is considered that the planting proposals would effectively soften the development and it would not appear dissimilar to the landscaping arrangements for the existing properties along The Bit. It is therefore considered the landscaping plan is acceptable and would retain an acceptable verdant nature to the front of the site as well as within it.

9.33 It is also noted that none of the trees within the site are protected and so planning permission for their removal would not be required.

Ecology

9.34 Hertfordshire Ecology have not provided comment on the proposal.

9.35 An ecology report comprising and preliminary ecological appraisal, preliminary bat appraisal, and bat emergence survey has been submitted.

9.36 The report notes that no protected species will be harmed as a result of the proposal, due the low likelihood of their presence on site.

9.37 The bat reports showed that the garage building had a negligible impact for roosting bats, with the existing office building have a low potential. As per guidelines, a single emergence survey was conducted with respect to the office building and emerging bats were recorded from the existing building to the front.

9.38 It is noted that the Ecology report is the same as that submitted for planning permission 21/02912/FUL for the conversion of the former office building to a dwelling. On this application the planning officer engaged with one of the ecology officers informally and the ecology officer considered the report acceptable and confirmed that the single emergence survey conducted was in line with accepted guidance. No further survey work were considered necessary. The report for that application is the same one which has been submitted for this application. Therefore, it has previously been confirmed by the ecology officer that they consider the report acceptable and that protected species do not form a constraint to the proposal.

Contamination

9.39 The scientific officer has been consulted on the application and has recommended a number of conditions relating to the submission of Environmental Risk Assessments prior to the commencement of development.

Flood Risk

9.40 The site is located in Flood Zone 1 and so is at low risk of surface water flooding. Therefore it is considered flood risk does not form a specific constraint to development in this location.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.41 The application is CIL liable.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The application is considered to constitute limited infilling within a village and is therefore an appropriate form of development within the Green Belt. The development would not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the Chiltern Hills AONB, residential amenity or the safety and operation of the highway. A number of trees would be removed but these are all category C and U to which the tree officer had no objection to. The landscaping plans would ensure the development maintains a soft appearance and integrates with existing landscaping along the lane.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be GRANTED.

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

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

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

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

**TGCR/21/PL01C
TGCR/21/PL02A
TGCR/21/PL03
TGCR/21/PL04A
TGCR/21/PL05
LP/WGTBWH/020B**

**Landscaping Statement (Davide Clarke Chartered Landscape Architect and Consultant Arboriculturist) (Submitted 27.01.22)
CS29 Checklist (July 2021)**

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

- 3. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the materials specified on the application form.**

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. Tree protection measures before and during the construction phases of the development shall be implemented and carried out in accordance with Tree Protection Plan TPP/WGTBWH/010A and the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement (David Clarke Chartered Landscape Architect and Consultant Arboriculturist - July 2021).**

Reason: In order to ensure that damage does not occur to trees and hedges during building operations in accordance with saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

5. **The landscaping works shown on drawing LPWGTBWH/020B and detailed within the submitted Landscape Statement (David Clarke Chartered Landscape Architect and Consultant Arboriculturist - submitted January 2022) 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 species, size and maturity.

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

6. **No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan (or Construction Method Statement)* has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including elements of the CLOCS standards as set out in the Highway Authority's Construction Management template. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan:**

The Construction Management Plan / Statement shall include details of:

- a. **Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing;**
- b. **Access arrangements to the site;**
- c. **Traffic management requirements**
- d. **Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking, loading / unloading and turning areas);**
- e. **Siting and details of wheel washing facilities;**
- f. **Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway;**
- g. **Timing of construction activities (including delivery times and removal of waste) and to avoid school pick up/drop off times;**
- h. **Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities;**

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS8 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

7. **Condition 1:**

(a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.

(b) If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:

- (i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;**
- (ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.**

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

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

(i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.

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

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

- 8. Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 7 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.**

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

Informative:

The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) & (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.

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

- 9. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of the layout and siting of Electric Vehicle Charging Points and any associated infrastructure shall be**

submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until these measures have been provided and these measures shall thereafter be retained fully in accordance with the approved details.

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

10. **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) the garages hereby permitted shall be kept available at all times for the parking of vehicles associated with the residential occupation of the dwellings and they shall not be converted or adapted to form living accommodation without the express permission of the local planning authority following the submission of a planning application.**

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory level of off-street parking and to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway, in accordance with saved Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS8 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), Paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Dacorum Borough Parking Standards Supplementary Parking Document (2020).

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.
2. If bats, or evidence for them, are discovered during the course of roof works, work must stop immediately and advice sought on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England to avoid an offence being committed.
3. All wild birds, nests and eggs are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The grant of planning permission does not override the above Act. All applicants and sub-contractors are reminded that site clearance, vegetation removal, demolition works, etc. between March and August (inclusive) may risk committing an offence under the above Act and may be liable to prosecution if birds are known or suspected to be nesting. The Council will pass complaints received about such work to the appropriate authorities for investigation. The Local Authority advises that such work should be scheduled for the period 1 September - 28 February wherever possible. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than 2 days in advance of vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
------------------	-----------------

Parish/Town Council	<p>OPPOSE - Not enough parking for 2 x 4 bed houses, Number of cars therefore increased use of The Bit which is an Unadopted road and already showing signs of wear, the coaches that used to come out actually had much better vision to exit the road which has hedges and often parked cars at the end so tricky to see what's coming, residents currently use the entrance as a turning circle which is essential to avoid needing to back out of the road onto Chesham Road. This raises further discussion as to how to get the road adopted and what implications this would have on the residents.</p>
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	<p>No objection on noise or air quality grounds.</p> <p>11.08.2021 (scientific officer):</p> <p>Having reviewed both the planning applications I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed developments, but that it will be necessary for the developer to demonstrate that the potential for land contamination to affect the proposed developments has been considered and where it is present will be remediated.</p> <p>This is considered necessary because the application sites are on land which have been previously developed and as such the possibility of ground contamination cannot be ruled out at this stage. This combined with the vulnerability of the proposed residential end use to the presence of any contamination means that the following planning conditions should be included on both applications if permission is granted.</p> <p>Contaminated Land Conditions:</p> <p>Condition 1:</p> <p>(a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.</p> <p>(b) If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:</p>

- (i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;
- (ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.

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

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

(i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.

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

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

Condition 2:

Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 1 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.

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

Informative:

The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) & (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.

	<p>The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land and I would be grateful if this fact could be passed on to the developers.</p>
<p>Affinity Water - Three Valleys Water PLC</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding this application. We have reviewed the development and do not have any comments to make.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Dylan Natrass</p>
<p>Thames Water</p>	<p>Waste Comments</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-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes.</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</p>

strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer networks.

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.

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.

Water Comments

There are water mains crossing or close to your development. Thames Water do NOT permit the building over or construction within 3m of water mains. If you're planning significant works near our mains (within 3m) we'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities during and after construction, 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-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>

If you are planning on using mains water for construction purposes, it's important you let Thames Water know before you start using it, to avoid potential fines for improper usage. More information and how to apply can be found online at thameswater.co.uk/buildingwater.

On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water network and water treatment infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application. Thames Water recommends the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p>	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>1) Construction Management Plan / Statement No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan (or Construction Method Statement)* has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including elements of the CLOCS standards as set out in the Highway Authority's Construction Management template. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan: The Construction Management Plan / Statement shall include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing; b. Access arrangements to the site; c. Traffic management requirements d. Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking, loading / unloading and turning areas); e. Siting and details of wheel washing facilities; f. Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway; g. Timing of construction activities (including delivery times and removal of waste) and to avoid school pick up/drop off times; h. Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities; <p>Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>Highway Informatives HCC as Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Note (AN) / highway informative to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out</p>
-------------------------------------	---

in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:

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

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

AN 2) Obstruction of highway: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence.

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

AN 3) Debris and deposits on the highway: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit compost, dung or other material for dressing land, or any rubbish on a made up carriageway, or any or other debris on a highway to the interruption of any highway user. Section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development and use thereafter are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is

available by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Comments

The proposal is for the change of use from Sui Generis to C3 residential. Construction of two pairs of semi detached dwellings comprising four x four bed houses on Land To R/O Cloudhill 5 Red Cottages, Chesham Road, Wigginton. The site was previously operated by a coach company where they had a repair shop on the proposed site. The site is not accessed directly from the adopted highway network and is instead accessed via The Bit. The Bit is not part of the adopted highway network and is a narrow single lane route that joins the highway network via an existing bellmouth junction onto Chesham Road.

Vehicle Access

The application is proposing to use the existing access both from The Bit and Chesham Road and therefore for this application no highway works are required. We would recommend that the access from The Bit is built to standards stipulated in Hertfordshire County Councils Design Guide. The Bit already provides access to 11 dwellings and previously accommodated the movement of large coaches. The increase in vehicle movements for the 4 dwellings are not considered to greatly impact The Bit or Chesham road in relation to the previous movement of large coaches and other operative vehicles. The 4 dwellings are deemed to lower the intensification of the previous use of the site.

Construction Management Plan

A construction management plan is required for the site to ensure that during demolition and construction works the narrow width route of The Bit is not greatly disrupted or blocked for the residents.

Refuse / Waste Collection

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

	<p>Emergency Vehicle Access drawing No. 20174 / TK02 Rev B illustrates a large refuse vehicle measuring 10.0-metres in length and 2.5-metres in width can enter and exit The Bit initially in reverse then forward gear which would also enable a large fire appliance to manoeuvre on site which is deemed acceptable and safe.</p> <p>Conclusion HCC has no objections or further comments on highway grounds to the proposed development, subject to the inclusion of the above highway informatives and condition.</p>
Trees & Woodlands	<p>Most of the trees on this site are round the edges and I think this reflects its previous use whereby the owners screened views of parked coaches with some planting. I agree with the tree ratings provided in the Arboricultural report and don't consider any of the trees of 'TPO' quality. However those that are to be retained will provide a mature backdrop for the development. A tree protection plan has been provided but while it mentions protective fencing it doesn't actually show where it is to be placed and so the plan need amending accordingly. The current proposal will result in tree loss and a dramatic change of view for some properties in The Bit however there is no right to a view or a screen. The landscape plan is adequate and together with planting that tends to happen over forthcoming years of most developments, should mature and soften the development.</p> <p>27.01.2022:</p> <p>It seems the report has covered the demolition of the building in section 13.1 with respect to T1 which is in accordance with current best practice. There maybe slight root disturbance during the process of removing the concrete slab but any root system will be minimal and this shouldn't be particularly damaging. No structure or covering is proposed to replace this slab so it may actually benefit the T1 long-term with increased water supply and nutrients to this area. I have no concerns regarding the demolition/slab removal.</p>
Parish/Town Council	<p>Objection due to restricted parking on site. This development would be acceptable if number of parking spaces would be adequate to the size of the property and parking spaces were on individual plots. The</p>

	suggestion is to adjust parking and make more space for parking on the plots to avoid parking on the road.
Thames Water	Please note that Thames Water have provided a formal response for the above application on the 02/08/2021.

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
31	5	0	4	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
Brew Cottage The Bit Wigginton Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6EQ	<p>The reasons for my objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *My understanding The Bit is an unadopted road and therefore querying right of access to development via The Bit? *The impact of heavy duty vehicles using The Bit during the construction of proposed development and additional cars as result of development and responsibility for making good and ongoing maintenance of The Bit *Requirement for ongoing use of turning point for residents of The Bit at entrance to planned development . Safety risks of reversing down The Bit and onto Chesham Rd if this turning point is not available as exiting The Bit onto Chesham Rd is a safety hazard due to parked vehicles on Chesham Rd either side of The Bit *Lack of adequate provision for car parking on proposed development area will exacerbate safety risks by increasing traffic using The Bit and potentially compromise ability for existing residents of The Bit to use entrance to development as a turning point. <p>For these reasons, any increase in traffic is undesirable</p> <p>The reasons for my objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *My understanding The Bit is an unadopted road and therefore querying right of access to development via The Bit? *The impact of heavy duty vehicles using The Bit during the construction of proposed development and additional cars as result of development and responsibility for making good and ongoing maintenance of The Bit *Requirement for ongoing use of turning point for residents of The Bit at entrance to planned development . Safety risks of reversing down The Bit and onto Chesham Rd if this turning point is not available as exiting The Bit onto Chesham Rd is a safety hazard due to parked vehicles on Chesham Rd either side of The Bit *Lack of adequate provision for car parking on proposed development area will exacerbate safety risks by increasing traffic using The Bit and potentially compromise ability for existing residents of The Bit to use

	<p>entrance to development as a turning point. For these reasons, any increase in traffic is undesirable</p>
<p>3 The Bit Wigginton Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6EQ</p>	<p>I believe this proposal to be overdevelopment of the site and wish to object to planning application 21/02925/FUL for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The effect on road safety, the free-flow of traffic, access for emergency services, refuse collection etc. due to the under provision of parking spaces. The current Dacorum requirement is for 3 spaces for each 4 bedroom dwelling. (Parking Standards SPD November 2020) Hence a total of 12 spaces are required whilst only 8 are being proposed. Furthermore, some of these are tandem spaces, some are garages and some are both. Para. 8.5 of the SPD allows tandem spaces only if additional parking on the highway is acceptable, which is not the case on Chesham Road near the junction with The Bit. Also, the Pre-Application Advice suggests that there is a need to remove tandem parking spaces. Para 6.7 of the SPD requires robust evidence of a high probability that garages will be used for parking and this has not been provided. Para 10 of the SPD requires a parking stress survey but this does not seem to have been done.</p> <p>2) The application accepts that very special circumstances are needed to justify this development in the Green Belt but two of the five given are invalid. The first very special circumstance claimed is the removal of the commercial use of the site. However this use has already ceased and the applicant admits that the site, which has been "marketed extensively" is unsuitable for the previous use and such a buyer could not be found. It is also extremely unlikely that the site will ever be used for commercial purposes because its value for housing, even on a reduced scale, would be far higher. Hence this does not constitute a very special circumstance. The other false claim is that there will be transport benefits and an improvement to highway safety. However this is based on a theoretical worst case scenario with a more intense use by commercial vehicles. Clearly this is not going to happen and so any benefit should rightly be assessed by comparison with the existing situation. As any additional housing on the vacant site will result in an increase in traffic, this is not a benefit but the exact opposite. The above means that the very special circumstances are reduced to three potential components, being housing need, landscaping and design so the balance that needs to be assessed is not just against the spacial impact on the openness of the Green Belt but also on the under provision of parking spaces and the many consequential adverse affects thereof. The is also an inconsistency in the information provided by the applicant. The red line showing the site for the 4 dwellings includes a part of The Bit whereas the blue line for the house on Chesham Road does not include that part of The Bit. This also raises the question as to the ownership of The Bit and whether the applicant has any access</p>

	<p>rights over The Bit for residential as opposed to commercial use. My objections still stand the amended plan does not go far enough to address the issues It is overdevelopment of this site</p> <p>There is still tandem parking spaces And we now have four garages Which is likely at these will be used for other things then parking a car in I believe it should have no garages at all .then the space have to be used for parking The applicant does not own the bit like it shows on the plan and their are no present movements from that site. When it did operate coaches I would say large vehicle coming out onto the Chesham Road are far safer than cars as can see over the park cars and not have to pull out halfway into the road before they can see properly round the increasing amount of parked cars both sides of the bit entrance The access to the new development from the bit is a lot smaller than already exists(The existing sweeping starts from the start of their plot) for over 25 years I've lived opposite, this being very important to me and the rest of the residence to allow passing of vehicles and delivery drivers and a like to reverse into and drive back down the bit. Rather than reversing out onto a main road which certainly would be suicidal with the amount of parked cars and traffic in the village nowadays how can Highways or yourselves not have a problem with this ?</p>
<p>Delldene Chesham Road Wigginton Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6EH</p>	<p>With regard to the above planning application whilst feeling that the design of the properties is appropriate to the area we would like to object to the proposed development on the grounds of inadequate parking. A garage and one parking space is insufficient for todays families and the site allows for no visitors cars.</p> <p>The Bit is a very narrow un-adopted track, whose ownership is unclear, although on one of the plans submitted the applicant suggests much of it is owned by them. As such any cars unable to park on the site will in all probability be parked on Chesham Road. This is the main road through the village used by a considerable number of large vehicles and already has a considerable number of parked cars with very few spaces for passing. Any further increase of parked vehicles will create a greater hazard especially exiting The Bit.</p> <p>We therefore object on the grounds of overdevelopment.</p> <p>Smaller buildings with more parking would seem more appropriate.</p>
<p>2 Red Cottages Chesham Road Wigginton Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6EH</p>	<p>We OPPOSE the planning application 21/02925/FUL as we believe the proposal to be an over development of the site. Our reasons for objecting are listed below.</p> <p>Backland Development</p> <p>The site lies within the Wigginton Village boundary which is designated as a small village located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Para 145 of the NPPF considers the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt to be inappropriate, however allows for some exceptions including limited infilling in villages. As the site is located within the Selected Small Village of Wigginton, policy CS6 should also be considered. CS6 allows limited infilling and infilling is defined as a form of development whereby buildings are proposed within a gap along a clearly identifiable built-up</p>

frontage or within a group of buildings. It does not include backland development or tandem development. Policy CS6 identifies that infilling will only be permitted where it is limited in scale. The term limited refers to development that does not create more than two extra dwellings, this proposal is for four additional dwellings.

The fact that the site can be accessed via The Bit seems to be being used as a reason to consider the proposal as an infill development. However, there are no houses facing onto the southern side of The Bit so we fail to understand how this could be considered infilling. This is a backland development. It is the view in the preapp response and is accepted by the applicant. It is a clear reason for refusal.

Traffic

We believe the Application makes a false claim that there will be transport benefits and improved highway safety. It suggests a reduction from up to 40 coach movements a day and 16 staff vehicles.

In over 20 years that we have lived in 2 Red Cottages we have never seen this amount of activity. In recent years it has been a maximum of perhaps 6 coach movements and 6 staff although now there are no movements to or from the site and the applicant admits a buyer cannot be found for commercial use. So, any additional housing on the site will only increase traffic movements on what the applicant states is "a narrow unlit, single carriageway lane with no footways". This traffic increase weakens the claim of very special circumstances.

The Bit is used by a considerable number of pedestrians, and as a through route from Chesham Road by parents walking their children to and from St Bartholomew's School.

The inadequate width of The Bit, poor visibility at the junction with Chesham Rd and use by pedestrians makes it entirely unsuitable for a new housing development.

Wakelin Associates Architects drawing TGCR/21/PL01 shows a Thick Chain Link Line (TCLL) that appears to indicate the extent of the plot. However, this TCLL encompasses part of The Bit which is not part of the plot but merely a right of way over this land (subject to paying a fair proportion of the expense of keeping this land in good repair). Ref. HM Land Registry Title HD403885.

Also, the TCLL has been drawn to exaggerate the width of The Bit. The usable width of this part of The Bit is in places only 260cm whereas the TCLL would indicate a width of more than twice this (approx. 525-550cm) by incorporating parts of abutting gardens. The TCLL shows The Bit to be only marginally narrower than the vehicular carriageway of Chesham Road which is obviously not the case. Or does this suggest that HCC Highways has a plan to adopt The Bit and to compulsorily purchase sections of land along its length?

The Bit is only just wide enough to allow the passage of a Refuse Collection Vehicle. Indeed, only recently I had a delivery of a bulk bag of sand from a building supplies company and their lorry could only reverse down The Bit with both of its wing mirrors folded in, relying on

the vehicle's reverse camera. The driver took several attempts before successfully completing the task. No pedestrians could pass by the lorry while it was making this manoeuvre nor while it was stationary.

The Transport Statement prepared on behalf of Mrs S Potter contains a drawing 20174/TK02 Rev B. This shows the Swept Path Analysis of a Refuse Vehicle, apparently passing over part of the garden of 5 The Bit.

Surely the applicant should be required to provide a detailed large scale and accurate plan of The Bit showing the carriageway width, plot boundaries, access points, hedge lines etc., including dimensions, to justify the suitability of it as an access for the proposed development.

Parking

I believe that Dacorum's current requirement is 3 spaces per 4 bed dwelling, a total of 12 spaces. The application proposes only 8 parking spaces, 6 of which comprise garages and parking spaces in tandem. How often are garages used for parking cars? And the pre-application advice suggests the need to remove tandem parking spaces.

There is nowhere on The Bit for parking and there is seldom spare parking space along Chesham Road near The Bit. Indeed, cars are often parked so close to The Bit that it is difficult to see oncoming traffic, from the right, when exiting The Bit onto Chesham Road.

The entrance from The Bit onto the site, in front of the security gate, has always been used as a passing place and as a turning point by residents of The Bit and delivery vehicles. The complete lack of any on-street parking on The Bit is already a problem to the extent that some people have been using the site entrance since closure for parking even though this hinders its use for passing and turning. Also, in view of the need to retain the entrance splay as an established point for turning and passing, any consent should include a condition removing permitted development rights for fences and gates between the line of the existing gates and the site boundary with The Bit.

Trees and Hedges

The whole site was some years ago edged with a planting of conifers to form a hedge. When we moved into 2 Red Cottages, I was able to reach to cut down some of the branches overhanging our parking area but in over 20 years this conifer hedge has grown substantially so that I no longer can. And not only does this deprive my vegetable plot of light, but it causes an immense nuisance from droppings from pigeons perched on its branches and by it dropping detritus onto our cars. Several branches have fallen into our property, particularly in strong winds and when snow or a heavy frost accumulates on its branches. This is potentially very dangerous. I have asked the owner, via the Architects, if these could be cut back to a maximum height of two metres but have yet to receive a reply.

Drawing TGCR/20/EX01 has the conifers in the northeast corner of the plot as being 10M firs. I have attempted to establish their height by triangulation and estimate them to be at least 17.5M tall.

The application shows (TGCR/21/PL01) that a number of conifers will be removed including two larches, attractive trees which I would happily see retained. However, the conifer hedge abutting our property, which ideally I would like removed, is shown as being retained.

These large conifers significantly contravene the High Hedges legislation and may have to be referred to Dacorum if the issue cannot be resolved otherwise.

Additionally, the proposal shows the planting of an Acer tight up against, and overhanging, our property, directly above where I park my car. This Acer campestre 'Lienco' when mature could reach 12M in height with a 6M spread. I have written to the Architects and asked if this could be planted 3M inside their site.