

**ITEM NUMBER: 5f**

<b>21/04555/FUL</b>	<b>Construction of 3x 2 bedroom and 3x 3 bedroom dwellings with associated site works and landscaping.</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>Land R/o 21 Water End Road Potten End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>	<b>Mr Groom</b>	<b>Ms Emma Adams</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>James Gardner</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	<b>Nettleden With Potten End Parish Council</b>	<b>Ashridge</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>Contrary view of Potten End Parish Council</b>	

**1. RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be **DELEGATED** with a view to **APPROVAL** subject to an appropriate assessment in accordance with article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive and securing a mitigation package to avoid any further significant effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) through financial contributions secured by legal agreement.

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 The proposal is considered to constitute limited infilling in a village and therefore accords with Policy CS6 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and paragraph 149 (e) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2.2 The proposed development would satisfactorily integrate with the local character and, through careful consideration of siting and design, would not result in any significant adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

3.1 The application site comprises of on an area of undeveloped land to the rear of no. 21 Water End Road, which is bounded to the north-west by Browns Spring and by commercial premises to the south-west.

**4. PROPOSAL**

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the construction of six two-storey dwellings, along with improvements (widening) of the existing access road, the provision of an estate road, and the provision of landscaping and private amenity areas.

**5. PLANNING HISTORY**

Planning Applications:

19/03263/FUL - Conversion and Alteration of Commercial Buildings to Form Single Dwelling  
*GRA - 1st May 2020*

Appeals:

None.

**6. CONSTRAINTS**

CIL Zone: CIL1  
Former Land Use (Risk Zone):  
Green Belt: Policy: CS5  
Parish: Nettleden with Potten End CP  
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Red (10.7m)  
Small Village: 1  
Parking Standards: New 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 Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)  
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

### Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development  
CS1 - Distribution of Development  
CS6 – Selected Small Villages in the Green Belt  
CS8 – Sustainable Transport  
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design  
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design  
CS12 - Quality of Site Design  
CS17 – New Housing  
CS18 – Mix of Housing  
CS19 – Affordable Housing  
CS26 – Green Infrastructure  
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction  
CS35 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

### Local Plan

Policy 12 - Infrastructure Provision and Phasing  
Policy 13 - Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations  
Policy 18 – The Size of New Dwellings  
Policy 21 – Density of Residential Development  
Policy 51 – Development and Transport Impacts  
Policy 54 – Highway Design  
Policy 55 – Traffic Management  
Policy 99 – Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands

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

The main issues to consider are:

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

### Principle of Development

9.1 The application site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

9.2 Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, it goes on to list exceptions to inappropriate development, which includes limited infilling in villages.

9.3 Policy CS6 of the Dacorum Core Strategy is supportive of limited infilling within Potten End provided that each development is:

- i. sympathetic to its surroundings, including the adjoining countryside, in terms of local character, design, scale, landscaping and visual impact; and
- ii. retains and protects features essential to the character and appearance of the village.

9.4 Policy CS6 indicates that the principle of limited infilling is acceptable only where it would provide affordable housing for local people.

9.5 Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that affordable housing should not be sought for residential development that are not major developments, the exception being developments within designated rural areas.

9.6 The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states that:

In designated rural areas local planning authorities may instead choose to set their own lower threshold in plans and seek affordable housing contributions from developments above that threshold. Designated rural areas applies to rural areas described under Section 157 (1) of the Housing Act 1985, which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

9.7 The application site is not located within the Chilterns AONB and no part of Dacorum has been designated as rural pursuant to Section 157 of the Housing Act 1985. Accordingly, there is no requirement for affordable housing to be provided on sites of less than 10 homes. As such, the application does not give rise to a requirement for affordable housing.

### Limited Infilling

9.8 As per the explanatory text to Policy CS6, the term 'limited' is taken to refer to development which does not create more than two extra dwellings. 'Infilling', meanwhile, is a form of development whereby buildings, most frequently dwellings, are proposed or constructed within a gap along a clearly identifiable built-up frontage or within a group of buildings.

9.9 While the explanatory text provides an interpretation of 'limited', the term is not defined within the policy wording itself (nor is it found within the definitions in the glossary to the Core Strategy) and thus there is an argument to say that it is advisory and should not be given the same weight as the policy text itself – a view endorsed by some Planning Inspectors.

9.10 The Core Strategy clearly does not build on the definition in the NPPF in any meaningful or unambiguous way, relying instead on the supported text to provide the required clarification, but not confirming whether this is policy or not. As such, it is submitted that the question of whether a proposed development would constitute limited infilling should be determined on a case-by-case basis.

9.11 Guidance in terms of the types of matters which may be relevant to the question of whether a particular development would comprise limited infilling was outlined in the Court of Appeal case of *R (Tate) v Northumberland County Council* [2018] EWCA Civ 1519, where the court held that:

*The question of whether a particular proposed development is to be regarded as "limited infilling" in a village for the purposes of the policy in paragraph 89 of the NPPF will always be essentially a question of fact and planning judgment for the planning decision-maker. There is no definition of "infilling" or "limited infilling" in the NPPF, nor any guidance there, to assist that exercise of planning judgment. It is left to the decision-maker to form a view, in the light of the specific facts. Can this proposed development be regarded as "limited infilling", or not, having regard to the nature and size of the development itself, the location of the application site and its relationship to other, existing development adjoining it, and adjacent to it? That is not the kind of question to which the court should put forward an answer of its own. Nor will it readily interfere with the decision-maker's own view.*

9.12 Infilling is typically thought of as constructing a building within a gap in a clearly identifiable built-up frontage; however, the term is not so specific that it precludes other forms of infilling. For example, where a building or buildings is constructed amongst a group of other buildings. It is this latter form of infilling which is relevant to the case in question.

### Whether the Proposal Constitutes Limited Infilling

9.13 The site comprises an irregular shaped area of land to the rear of nos. 17 – 23 Water End Road, which is surrounded on all sides by built development. It is therefore considered that the development would be a form of infilling.

9.14 The second step is to establish whether the scale of the proposed development is limited.

9.15 The provision of six dwellings would be limited insofar as it would be a modest addition to the existing built form of Potten End. In addition, the scale of development is such that it is classed as minor, not major development. Further, the site layout plan shows that the development can be accommodated relatively comfortably within the confines of the site in a form not dissimilar to the

surrounding development. Taking these factors into account, it is submitted that the proposed development would comprise of limited infilling.

### Policy CS6 Impact Assessment

9.16 Policy CS6 of the Dacorum Core Strategy requires an assessment to be made as to whether the development would be sympathetic to its surroundings and the surrounding countryside, as well as retaining and protecting features essential to the character and appearance of the village.

9.17 Modest terraced dwellings – surrounded on all sides by built form - with both front and rear gardens are proposed. While visible from private views (primarily from the dwellings in Browns Spring), the dwellings are likely to have limited visibility from public vantage points. Where visible, given their limited height and relatively close proximity to other built form, it is not considered that the visual impact would be significant or jarring.

9.18 The design of the dwellings – i.e. their scale, form and architectural detailing – are considered to retain and protect features essential to the character and appearance of the village.

### Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.19 Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy state that development should, inter alia, respect the typical density intended in an area, preserve attractive streetscapes, protect or enhance significant views within character areas, and integrate with the streetscape character. Policy CS12 further states that development should respect adjoining properties in terms of layout, site coverage, scale, height, bulk, materials and amenity space.

### Design

9.20 The dwellings are to be laid out in two staggered terraced rows, each containing three dwellings. They are of relatively simple design, though do contain some traditional features – such as the brick headers above the ground floor fenestration and chimney stacks. The proposed external materials comprise of brick at ground floor and render at first floor. The doors and windows, meanwhile, are stated as being of timber construction. It is considered that the mix of materials is congruent with the prevailing character of the area, while the scale, height and roof forms all appear appropriate to the village setting.

### Impact on Street Scene

9.21 The dwellings would have a relatively limited presence, from the Water End Road street scene. Glimpsed views of Plots 4 – 6 may be possible through a builder's yard adjacent to an MOT test centre on Browns Spring, but this would be from a considerable distance (approximately 50m); and, what is more, visibility does not necessarily equate to harm. In light of the fact that the rear elevations of Plots 4 – 6 are proposed to utilise materials which reflect the local character and are limited to two-storeys, it is not considered that there would be any harm to the street scene should they be visible.

9.22 There is currently a limited amount of informal landscaping along the builder's yard boundary. The result is that views into the application site are limited to a degree. The plans suggest that this is to be removed, the result of which would be a slight opening up of the site during the summer months. However, there is no reason why a suitable landscaping scheme could not improve upon the existing situation. Therefore, should Members resolve to grant planning permission, it is recommended that a condition requiring the approval and implementation of a landscaping scheme be included on the decision notice.

### Density Considerations

9.23 Concerns have been raised by some local residents with regard to the density of the proposed development.

9.24 Policy CS11 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) states that, within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should, inter alia, respect the typical density intended in an area.

9.25 Saved Policy 21 of the Dacorum Local Plan provides guidance pertaining to density and states that '*Densities will generally be expected in the range of 30 to 50 dwellings per hectare net.*'

9.26 Housing density can be measured in a number of ways:

- Number of dwellings per hectare (dph)
- Number of habitable rooms; and
- Quantity of floor area.

9.27 Dwellings per hectare is the most commonly used measure and it is therefore appropriate to use this to analyse the proposal.

9.28 The density of the application site post development would equate to approximately 29 dph. This compares with a density of approximately 24 dph for the semi-detached dwellings on the south-eastern side of Browns Spring and 50 dph for nos. 3, 5, 7, 11 and 13 Water End Road.

9.29 In summary, it is considered that the density of the proposed development is in accordance with the surrounding densities.

### Amenity Space

9.30 Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) states that residential development is required to provide private open space for use by residents whether the development be houses or flats. Private gardens should normally be positioned to the rear of the dwelling and have an average minimum depth of 11.5 metres. An allowance is made for infill developments where garden depths below 11.5m but of equal depth to adjoining properties.

9.31 Garden depths across the site would range from between 11.8m – 19.8m. The gardens also benefit from reasonable widths, ensuring a good level of functionality. The garden of Plot 3 has a depth of 11.8m but this is at only one point: due to the tapering nature of the boundary, the depth of the garden varies quite substantially. It is, however, considered that its very generous width compensates for this.

9.32 In summary, the width, shape and size of the amenity spaces would ensure that they are functional and provide a good level of amenity to future occupiers.

### Impact on Residential Amenity

9.33 Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that development should, inter alia, avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to surrounding properties.

9.34 Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan states that residential development should be designed and positioned in such a way that a satisfactory level of sunlight and daylight is maintained for existing and proposed dwellings, and that significant overshadowing should be avoided.

### Loss of Sunlight and Daylight

9.35 The application site is located to the south-east of the dwellings on Browns Spring. Given the limited height of the proposed dwellings, coupled with their distance from the dwellings on Brown Spring, it is considered that there would not be any significant adverse impacts on daylight and sunlight.

9.36 In terms of the dwellings on Water End Road, these are located to the south of the application site and, in general, are set well away from the proposed development and should not therefore experience any significant loss of daylight and sunlight.

9.37 It is acknowledged that no. 13 Water End Road has a flank window which faces into the application site, and that the flank wall of Plot 6 would be located approximately 5m away from this window. Based on plans submitted in support of planning application 4/01326/96/FHA, it is understood that the window in question serves a dual aspect master bedroom. Two further windows serving this bedroom are located on the front elevation, which are likely to facilitate ample light ingress into the room.

### Visual Intrusion

9.38 There is no statutory planning definition of visual intrusion or whether development is overbearing. The proximity of built development, height, mass and bulk, topography, orientation and the existing layouts of adjoining dwellings are all relevant factors. As such, whether development is visually intrusive or overbearing is a matter of planning judgement.

9.39 The relationship between Plot 4 and the nearest dwellings on Browns Spring – i.e. Meadow View and Hill View - has been considered in detail. In particular, the following points are considered to be of relevance:

- Flank wall of Plot 4 is angled.
- Positioning Plot 4 is such that approximately 50% of the garden of Hill View would have an open aspect.
- Separation distance in excess of 23m.
- Mixture of materials will break down the massing.
- Potential for supplementary planting along the boundary.

9.40 In light of the above, it is submitted that there would not be an unacceptable level of visual intrusion. This also applies to all other dwellings surrounding the application site.

### Loss of Privacy

9.41 There would be a separation distance in excess of 30m between the rear elevations of Plots 1 – 2 and the rear elevations of Lynwood, Longview and Springside in Browns Spring. The level of separation does reduce to slightly below 30m in respect of Plot 3's relationship with Longview and Larches; however, notwithstanding the change in levels, it is considered that this would afford an acceptable level of privacy for concerned.

9.42 Due to the positioning of the new dwellings the level of overlooking would be less direct. Views of the amenity areas of the aforementioned dwellings would be possible; however, a certain degree of mutual overlooking is to be expected in a residential area, and in this instance it is not considered that the resultant level of overlooking would seriously impinge upon the ability of residents to enjoy this space.

9.43 The positioning of Plot 1 is such that it would be afforded views of the rear garden of Jenady. However, there are a few relevant points of consideration:

- 1) Plot 1 faces away from Jenady and thus views will be oblique and limited to the lower half of the garden.
- 2) The rear garden of Jenady is already overlooked by the first floor windows of Hillcrest to an arguably greater degree.
- 3) A certain degree of mutual overlooking is not unexpected in residential areas of villages.

9.44 The flank elevation of Plot 4 has an oblique relationship with the rear elevations of Hill View and Meadow View and is located between 25 and 27m away. No side facing windows are proposed. As above, this is considered to be an acceptable separation distance.

9.45 No windows are proposed in the flank elevation of Plot 6. As such, the first floor window in the flank elevation of no. 13 Water End Road would not be adversely affected in terms of loss of privacy.

9.476 The primary amenity area of no. 13 Water End Road is located to the front of the property, which is unusual and will, as a result, reduce to a degree the expectation of privacy – e.g. delivery drivers and other visitors to the property will be able to see the garden in the course of carrying out their lawful business. The proposed site layout plan (drawing no. 2714.13 B) shows the relationship between Plot 6 and no. 13, and although there would be windows on the rear elevation of the new dwelling, in reality, this is unlikely to afford views of anything other than the end of the private access drive and, perhaps, very oblique views of the front garden area. As such, on balance, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse loss of privacy.

#### Noise and Disturbance

9.47 Given the residential nature of the use and the distances involved, it is considered unlikely that there would be any significant adverse impacts arising from noise following completion of the construction process. Should excessive and unneighbourly levels of noise occur from day-to-day living, this would fall within the remit of the Council's Environmental Health Team.

9.48 In response to concerns raised by local residents in connection with noise and disturbance during the construction process, this would be for a time-limited period and subject to the usual Environmental Health rules regarding working hours.

#### **Impact on Highway Safety Car Parking**

##### Highway Safety

9.49 Policy 51 of the Dacorum Local Plan states that the acceptability of all development proposals will be assessed specifically in highway and traffic terms and should have no significant impact upon, inter alia:

- the nature, capacity and use of the highway network and its ability to accommodate the traffic generated by the development; and
- the environmental and safety implications of the traffic generated by the development.

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

9.51 The site is currently accessed by way of an existing dropped kerb and private access road. Subject to the road being widened – as shown on drawing no. 2714.13 B – the Highway Authority is satisfied that it would be fit for purpose and not give rise to any concerns in respect of highway safety. Should planning permission be granted, it is recommended that a condition be included requiring the access road to have been widened prior to first occupation of the dwellings.



9.52 Given the relatively constrained nature of the site, although not explicitly mentioned in their formal response, the Highway Authority has concurred that a Construction Management Plan would be appropriate.

#### Manoeuvrability

9.53 Section 7.2.2 of Manual for Streets (MfS) states that carriageway widths should be appropriate for the particular context and uses of the street. In determining an appropriate width, regard should be had to such matters as:

- the volume of vehicular traffic;
- the traffic composition; and
- whether parking is to take place on the carriageway

9.54 MfS illustrates the type of vehicles various carriageway widths can accommodate. Carriageway widths of 4.1 metres are sufficient to permit two cars to pass one another with care, while carriageway widths of 4.8 metres will allow two cars to pass one another with relative ease, and larger vehicles with care.

9.55 Following widening, the access road would measure approximately 5 metres, which is considered sufficient for the likely flow and type of vehicles that will be accessing the development.

#### Emergency Access

9.56 Hertfordshire Fire Rescue have stated that the site is not suitable for a fire appliance and thus require the provision of an on-site fire hydrant. A viable location has been agreed upon by both the Fire Safety Inspector and the Water Officer. Full details of the hydrant are to be reserved by condition should Members be minded to resolve to grant planning permission.

#### Parking

9.57 Policy CS8 of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that new development should provide sufficient, safe and convenient parking based on car parking standards, while Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that development should provide sufficient parking and sufficient space for servicing.

9.58 The Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document was formally adopted on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2020 and advocates the use of a 'parking standard' (rather than a maximum or minimum standard), with different levels of standard in appropriate locations and conditions to sustain lower car ownership.

9.59 Section 6 of the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document states that:

*The starting principle is that all parking demand for residential development should be accommodated on site; and the requirements shown are 'standards' - departures from these will only be accepted in exceptional cases, when appropriate evidence is provided by the agent/developer for consideration by the Council, and the Council agrees with this assessment...*

*Different standards for C3 use are provided as set out in the table in Appendix A, based on the three accessibility zones referred to in section 4.8 and shown in Appendix B.*

9.60 The application site is located within Accessibility Zone 3 wherein the expectation is that the following parking provision would be achieved:

2 bedrooms	Allocated	1.50
	Unallocated	1.20
3 bedrooms	Allocated	2.25
	Unallocated	1.80

9.61 The first step in calculating parking requirement for new development is to establish the number of bedrooms within the respective dwellings. In this case, there is some question as to the whether the rooms identified as offices shown on the floorplans in respect of Plots 1, 2 and 3 should be considered as bedroom space.

9.62 The studies do not provide the necessary floor area and dimensions to count as a single bedspace as defined in the National Described Space Standards. Paragraph 6 of the space standards states that:

*Relating internal space to the number of bedspaces is a means of classification for assessment purposes only when designing new homes and seeking planning approval (if a local authority has adopted the space standard in its Local Plan). It does not imply actual occupancy, or define the minimum for any room in a dwelling to be used for a specific purpose other than in complying with this standard.*

9.63 However, it is submitted that calculating parking requirements based on a document which itself states that it does not imply actual occupancy, or define the minimum size for any particular type of room, is not the correct approach. Rather, in the first instance, it is appropriate to refer to the car parking standards themselves.

9.64 The Parking Standards SPD does not provide a methodology to define bedrooms. The way in which this is established is therefore a matter for the decision maker. One approach would be to have regard to the location of the room within the dwelling and, having established that the location is appropriate, ascertain whether it would be physically capable of accommodating a bed. For reference, a single bed has a measurement of approximately 1.90m (L) x 0.90m (W) and thus all the offices would be capable (just) of functioning as bedroom space.

9.65 The above notwithstanding, it must be acknowledged that the COVID-19 pandemic has fundamentally changed the ways in which people work, and it is not therefore unreasonable to conclude that the provision of offices would make these dwellings more desirable to those wishing to work from home on a permanent or semi-permanent basis. It follows that a room used in such a way would be unlikely to serve a dual function (i.e. office and bedroom space), thereby calling into question whether the room should be treated as a bedroom for the purposes of calculating car parking requirements. The most likely scenario is, perhaps, a mixture of the two: some rooms designated as offices will be used for that purpose while others will be used as bedroom space.

9.66 Proceeding on the basis that it is not appropriate to treat the offices as bedroom space, the development would give rise to a parking requirement of 11 spaces (11.25 rounded down to the nearest whole number). By contrast, if the studies were considered to constitute bedroom space, there would be a parking requirement of 14 spaces (13.5 rounded up to the nearest whole number).

9.67 The proposed site layout shows 12 spaces – two per dwelling. Accordingly, there would be a surplus of one space or a deficit of two spaces depending on which approach is taken. It is noted that the parking areas serving Plots 3 and 6 would be capable of accommodating a further two spaces each without detriment or loss of manoeuvrability to the neighbouring plots if tandem parking were to be adopted.

9.68 Paragraph 8.5 provides the relevant guidance vis-à-vis tandem spaces, the full text of which has been provided below for ease of reference:

*Tandem (in-line) parking generally means that the provision of two parking places one after another, configured like a single, double-length perpendicular parking place. Tandem parking is inconvenient, and both spaces may not be used at all times. It should not be used for unallocated, off-plot spaces; however, it 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. Consequently, the presumption is for tandem spaces counting as part of the parking provision if on-plot provided they are allocated spaces.*

9.69 Given the distance of the dwellings from the adopted highway, it is considered that it would be less inconvenient for residents to use the tandem spaces than locating a parking space on the highway. Water End Road is therefore remote, while the width of the access road and the general rights of access along it is likely to preclude parking.

9.70 In summary, whilst not ideal, the tandem parking would ensure the development is fully compliant with the parking standards if a stricter interpretation is taken in respect of the offices.

### Conclusion

9.71 The Highway Authority are satisfied that there would be no adverse impacts on highway or pedestrian safety, and the level of parking provision is considered to be appropriate.

9.72 The development is therefore considered to accord with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy, the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020) and saved Policy 51 of the Dacorum Local Plan and the NPPF.

### **Other Material Planning Considerations**

#### *Contamination*

9.73 The Council's Scientific Officer has been consulted and has advised that he has no objections on the grounds of land contamination subject to the inclusion of appropriately worded planning conditions.

#### *Sewage Capacity*

9.74 Thames Water have confirmed that their network has sufficient capacity to handle an additional six dwellings in this location.

#### *Affordable Housing*

9.75 As outlined in the Policy and Principle section of this report, the development does not give rise to a requirement for affordable housing contributions.

#### *Impact on Trees and Landscaping*

9.76 The trees along the north-western boundary of the site do not appear to have a high level of amenity value. However, it is appreciated that they will have ecological value and provide a form of screening. Should Members be minded to grant permission, it is recommended that conditions are included to require the submission of a tree protection plan and landscaping plan.

#### *Permitted Development Rights*

9.77 Section 72 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 empowers to impose conditions on a grant of planning permission for:

*regulating the development or use of any land under the control of the applicant (whether or not it is land in respect of which the application was made) or requiring the carrying out of works on any such land, so far as appears to the local planning authority to be expedient for the purposes of or in connection with the development authorised by the permission.*

9.78 However, it has been held by the courts that the power within section 72 is somewhat more limited and must meet certain 'tests'. These are set out in paragraph 56 of the NPPF:

- Necessary,
- Relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted,
- Enforceable,
- Precise
- Reasonable in all other respects.

9.79 The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides the following guidance in terms of the removal of permitted development rights:

*Conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use may not pass the test of reasonableness or necessity. The scope of such conditions needs to be precisely defined, by reference to the relevant provisions in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, so that it is clear exactly which rights have been limited or withdrawn.*

9.80 In terms of the development in question, in having regard to the above, it is considered that a condition restricting permitted development rights would be justified.

9.81 It is considered appropriate to remove permitted development rights in respect of Class B for all plots given the potential impact the provision of additional bedroom accommodation in the respective roof spaces could have on parking within the site and the surrounding area; and, in the case of Plots 1 – 3, the overlooking implications this could have given the change in levels between the application site and the dwellings in Browns Spring.

9.82 In addition to the above, it is considered appropriate to remove Class A rights for Plots 1-3. This is due to the staggered nature of the rear building line: If a 3m rear extension were to be constructed by either of these dwellings, the impacts would be magnified over and above what the government envisaged when drafting the General Permitted Development Order.

9.83 This approach is considered to be in accordance with paragraph 56 of the NPPF.

#### *Chiltern Beechwood Special Area of Conservation*

9.84 Following a letter from Natural England on the 14<sup>th</sup> March and publication of the Footprint Ecology Report, the Council is unable to grant permission for planning applications which result in a net gain of dwellings located within the zone of influence of the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area

of Conservation (CBSAC) until an appropriate assessment of the scheme can be undertaken and appropriate mitigation secured to offset the recreational pressures and adverse effects of new development to the CBSAC.

9.85 The Council is working with Natural England and other relevant partners to agree a mitigation strategy and, once adopted, this will enable the Council to carry out their legal duties and grant residential development in the Borough. Once adopted, the mitigation strategy is likely to require financial contributions from developers to mitigate the additional recreational pressure placed on Ashridge Common and Tring Woodlands as a standard contribution per dwelling.

9.86 However, at this time, in the absence of a mitigation strategy, there is insufficient evidence to allow the Council to rule out that the development would not cause additional recreational pressure to the CBSAC and that its impacts, whether alone or in combination, could be avoided or mitigated so as to ensure that the integrity of the SAC would be preserved. However, the council should continue to work pro-actively in reaching a resolution on planning applications subject to securing the above.

9.87 Therefore, should Members be minded to approve the application, it is proposed that the decision be held in abeyance until such time as a mitigation strategy has been agreed and the Council can thereafter satisfy its legal duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019 (as amended).

#### *Ecology*

9.88 No buildings are proposed to be demolished, and as such, the development does not give rise to any concerns with regard to bats. Whilst the site is currently undeveloped, it mainly comprises of grass with intermittent trees / hedging along the boundary with Browns Spring. On this basis it is not considered that the ecological value of the site is particularly high. It follows that the development would not irreparably damage the local ecology. A landscaping condition is proposed which will assist in ensuring a reasonable level tree planting takes place.

#### *Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)*

9.89 Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on 1 July 2015. This application is CIL liable.

#### Planning Obligations

9.90 Financial contribution (to be determined) to secure a mitigation package to avoid any further significant effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation.

## **10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 The application represents limited infilling in a village and is therefore acceptable in principle. Careful consideration has been given to the design and layout of the proposed dwellings and it is considered that an appropriate balance has been struck between maximising the use of the site while respecting the character of the surrounding area.

10.2 Subject to a widening of the access road, which will allow two cars to pass each other comfortably, the Highway Authority is satisfied that the intensification of the access would not give rise to any concerns from a highway safety perspective. Whether the offices in the Plots 1-3 are treated as bedrooms or not, it is considered that there would be sufficient parking on-site.

10.3 It is acknowledged that the site is surrounded by development on all sides and that there would inevitably be change in outlook to existing residents. This notwithstanding, following a careful review of the plans it is considered that, on balance, the new development would not result in any significant adverse impacts on residential amenity.

## 11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be **DELEGATED** with a view to **APPROVAL** subject to an appropriate assessment in accordance with article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive and securing a mitigation package to avoid any further significant effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) through financial contributions secured by legal agreement.

### 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:**

**Drawing 2714.13 B Proposed Site Layout**

**Drawing 2714.15 A Proposed Plan 3-Bed Cottages Plots 4, 5 and 6**

**Drawing 2714.16 Proposed Elevations 3-Bed Cottages Plots 4, 5 and 6**

**Drawing 2714.17 Proposed Plans 2-bed Cottages Plots 1, 2 and 3**

**Drawing 2714.18 Proposed Elevations 2-bed Cottages Plots 1, 2 and 3**

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

3. **No development above slab level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

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

4. **The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the access road has been widened as shown on drawing no. 2714.13 B (Proposed Site Layout).**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users, in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and Policy 51 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004).

5. **(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 Policy 32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013).

- 6. Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 5 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 Policy 32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013).

Informative:

The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 174 (e) & (f) and 183 and 184 of the NPPF 2021.

Guidance on how to assess and manage the risks from land contamination can be found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/land-contamination-risk-management-lcrm>

7. **No development above slab level shall take place until details of fire hydrants or other measures to protect the development from fire have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall include provision of the mains water services for the development whether by means of existing water services, new mains, or extension to or diversion of existing services where the provision of fire hydrants is considered necessary. The proposed development shall not be occupied until such measures have been implemented in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure that sufficient strategic infrastructure is provided to support the development, and to ensure a safe and satisfactory means of access for the fire service, in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS35 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013).

8. **No development above slab level 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;**
- **soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs;**
- **minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, signs, refuse or other storage units, etc.); and**
- **retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.**

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

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

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

9. **Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction) setting out how trees shown for retention shall be protected during the construction process, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. No equipment, machinery or materials for the development shall be taken onto the site until these details have been approved. The works must then be carried out according to the approved details and thereafter retained until competition of the development.**

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).



10. **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within the following classes of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority:**

**Plots 1 – 6**

**Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B**

**Plots 1 – 3**

**Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A**

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential and visual amenity of the locality in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

11. **Prior to the commencement of any below ground construction works (including the erection of any foundations) a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan should consider all phases (excluding demolition) of the development. The construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan which shall include details of:**

- **construction vehicle numbers and type;**
- **traffic management requirements;**
- **construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking);**
- **siting and details of wheel washing facilities;**
- **cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway;**
- **timing of construction activities (to avoid school pick up/drop off times);**
- **provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities;**
- **post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway;**
- **construction or demolition hours of operation; and**
- **dust and noise control measures.**

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), Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

12. **Notwithstanding the details shown on drawing no. 2714.13 B (Proposed Site Layout) prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, full details (including specifications) 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.**

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).

13. **Prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved, the rear amenity areas shall be provided and laid out in accordance with drawing no. 2714.13 B (Proposed Site Layout) and thereafter permanently retained.**

Reason: In order to ensure that the dwellings have (and retain) sufficient amenity space, in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004).

14. **No development shall take place until details of the proposed slab, finished floor and ridge levels of the building(s) in relation to the existing and proposed levels of the site and the surrounding land shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The building(s) shall be constructed in accordance with the approved levels.**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, to ensure a satisfactory form of development and in the interests of the residential amenity of the surrounding dwellings, in accordance with saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) and Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013).

15. **Prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted, details of a scheme to alert motorists of the potential presence of pedestrians on the access road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.**

**The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation and permanently retained.**

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian safety, in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and Policy 51 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004).

#### **Informatives:**

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.

#### 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.

#### 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.

2. If bats, or evidence for them, are discovered during the course of tree 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.
4. In accordance with the Councils adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours - 07:30 to 17:30 on Monday to Friday, 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturday and no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.
5. Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or carrying out of other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The Applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.
6. The attention of the Applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites.

#### APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<u>01/02/2022</u>  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.

#### Highway Informatives

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

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

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

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

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN 3) Debris and deposits on the highway: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit compost, dung or other material for dressing land, or any rubbish on a made up carriageway, or any or other debris on a highway to the interruption of any highway user. Section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development and use thereafter are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available by telephoning 0300 1234047.

#### Comments

The proposal is regarding amendments for the construction of 3x 2 bedroom and 3x 3 bedroom dwellings with associated site works and landscaping at Land R/o 21 Water End Road, Potten End. Water End Road is a 30 mph classified C local distributor route that is highway maintainable at public expense. The amendments are following

	<p>comments from the Herts Fire and Rescue concerning the fire access for the site.</p> <p><b>Vehicle Access</b>  There is an exiting dropped kerb and access to the rear of the site which used to serve a service yard for a nearby business. This access is proposed to be used for the 6 new dwellings with the existing dropped kerb. Although Dropped kerbs are normally only permitted for 5 dwellings, in this instance 6 dwellings are considered acceptable owing to an alternative bellmouth access considered to be inappropriate for the site. The amended drawings illustrate that two vehicles will be able to pass each other, however, this will only be achievable if the foliage is cut back. Vehicles are able to turn on site to enter and exit the highway network in forward gear as per Road in Hertfordshire which his deemed necessary.</p> <p><b>Drainage</b>  The proposed new driveways would need to make adequate provision for drainage on site to ensure that surface water does not discharge onto the highway. Surface water from the existing driveway would need be collected and disposed of on site.</p> <p><b>Refuse / Waste Collection</b>  Provision would need to be made for an on-site bin-refuse store within 30m of each dwelling and within 25m of the kerbside/bin collection point. The collection method must be confirmed as acceptable by DBC waste management.</p> <p><b>Emergency Vehicle Access</b>  Herts Fire and rescue has stated that the site is not suitable for a fire appliance and have instead insisted that the site have a fire hydrant. This will need to be agreed by both the fire service and the LPA and is no longer a highways issues.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b>  HCC has no objections or further comments on highway grounds to the proposed development, subject to the inclusion of the above highway informatives.</p>
Parish/Town Council	<p><u>22/12/2021</u></p> <p>Object pending more information.</p> <p>The site is in the Green Belt but not in the Conservation Area or AONB. The Parish Council accepts that because of the site's location surrounded by other housing that its development would constitute limited infilling which would not have an impact on the openness of the</p>

Green Belt and would contribute to identified affordable housing needs and therefore that it would comply with the exception to development in the Green Belt set out in NPPF 149. However the Council has concerns about the impact on the sewerage system, density and design on which there is insufficient information.

The plan to build 2- and 3-bedroom houses is welcome, as past housing need assessments have highlighted the need for housing of this size in the village.

We note that the application says surface water drainage will be dealt with using a soakaway which means that it won't be going in the sewer system, but because of the history of sewerage problems in Browns Spring (see below) we would like Thames Water explicitly to confirm that it will not contribute to any other issues.

We have repeatedly raised the issue of sewerage in Browns Spring immediately below the proposed new development in recent applications which grow the volume of houses in the area ' we have had residents with raw sewage flooding their gardens and Thames in regular attendance to carry out remedial activities. In our opinion it is not sufficient for Thames Water to say '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' Sewerage has been a major problem in this area for at least thirty years, on occasion being addressed by residents having to invest in suitable equipment to stop sewage entering their homes and gardens. We need to understand how Thames intends to address this issue now, not at some indeterminate time in the future, and certainly before this application which by definition can only increase pressure on the system can be agreed.

With regard to density we would like information about the proposed plot sizes as we have concerns that 6 houses represents an overdevelopment of this small area. Prima facie the plots are small relative to those in Browns Spring and Olivers Close for e.g., but there are already small plots in Elm Tree Cottages and plots in the centre of the village around The Front and Back which are significantly smaller. Realistically, in order to achieve a mix of housing in terms of affordability, we accept the need for some mix of housing in terms of plot sizes but it may be that plots 4,5,6 might be better as a pair?

More details are required of the type of trees and hedging that is proposed as this will affect the impact on amenities for the houses in

	<p>Olivers Close ' for eg will the trees be evergreen, what height will they be?</p> <p>The ridgeline does appear quite high and again there is an absence of measurements which we would like to see; would it be possible to reduce the height of the eaves? We would also like to see a topographical view to make clear the relationship between the new development and the houses in Olivers Close bordering the new development and which will be further down the slope.</p> <p>Concern has been expressed regarding access to the site, as well as the new junction with Water End Rd, which can be a busy road. We urge the Highways Authority to look carefully at this application and its implications, both in terms of access by emergency or service vehicles, and the safety of cars turning in and out of this development.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>Having reviewed the planning application I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed development, but that it will be necessary for the developer to demonstrate that the potential for land contamination to affect the proposed development has been considered and where it is present will be remediated.</p> <p>This is considered necessary because the application is on a site close to a land use which may have resulted in contamination 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 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 174 (e) & (f) and 183 and 184 of the NPPF 2021.

Guidance on how to assess and manage the risks from land



	<p>contamination can be found here  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/land-contamination-risk-management-lcrm">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/land-contamination-risk-management-lcrm</a></p> <p>Please let me know if you have any questions.</p> <p>Victoria Persen  (Graduate Environmental Health Technical Officer)</p> <p>I have reviewed the documentation submitted in support of this application and do not have any observation or objection to the development of dwellings marked 1,2, and 3 on Drawing reference 2714.13. However, I am concerned as regards the close proximity of the proposed dwellings marked 4, 5, and 6 to an existing vehicle repair workshop (B&amp;H Autos, Browns Spring). I am not aware of any assessment undertaken by the applicant as to the potential impact of noise from this workshop on the residential amenity of the future residents of these dwellings and therefore I cannot recommend that permission be granted at this stage. I would therefore suggest that determination of this application is deferred until such time the applicant has furnished more information on the noise from this workshop to the Local Planning Authority and, as appropriate, clearly set out any mitigation measures that are necessary to protect future residential amenity.</p>
Thames Water	<p>WASTE:</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</p>

	<p>disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Management of surface water from new developments should follow guidance under sections 167 &amp; 168 in the National Planning Policy Framework. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services</a>.</p> <p>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:</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>
<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p>	<p><u>16/12/2021</u></p> <p>Proposal Construction of 3x 2 bedroom and 3x 3 bedroom dwellings with associated site works and landscaping</p> <p>Decision Interim</p> <p>This response is an interim owing to concerns regarding the width of initial drive to the development. From observations HCC Highways has measured the drive as being below the 3.7 metres required. I would note that within the design and access statement it states that the;</p> <p>"minimal width for a fire tender for access is 3.7m which is achieved within this proposal."</p> <p>This is correct but the 3.7 metres must also be the width of the drive leading to the site. Therefore, as HCC Highways is not the fire service, we will pass our concerns over to Herts fire and rescue to deem if the site is fire safe. It is noted that no works are to be done to the highway network. The fire service will individually contact DBC with there response. We would agree with any decision Herts fire and rescue make. If they agree that the site is safe in terms of fire access then HCC Highways would like to be re consulted to finalise our recommendation.</p>

Trees & Woodlands	The information submitted indicates there are trees in close proximity to the proposed dwellings and associated hard standings which may be detrimentally affected. In order to ensure they are afforded appropriate protection I require the applicant to submit further information in the form of a tree survey, as described in BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. The survey should recommend suitable protection and construction methods to minimise impact of the development to all adjacent trees.
Fire Hydrants	This case will require a condition for the provision and installation of fire hydrants, at no cost to the county or Fire and Rescue Service. This is to ensure all proposed dwellings have adequate supplies for in the event of an emergency.
Parish/Town Council	<p><u>10/03/2022</u></p> <p>Objection</p> <p>The Parish Council is grateful for the additional comments provided by the developer.</p> <p>With regard to sewerage, the Council has now met Thames Water. As previously reported, houses immediately below the proposed development have struggled with effluent flowing into their gardens which has only been corrected through a combination of case by case action by Thames and the householders installing at their own expense one-way valves. Thames have offered to provide the council with evidence that the system overall has capacity to cope with additional houses but to date this hasn't been forthcoming. The council remains very concerned at the impact on its residents of more houses being added to the system until Thames can provide evidence that it can cope with the additional capacity.</p> <p>The Council sees nothing in the additional comments regarding the density of development to change its original view that the proposal represents over-development of this site.</p>

## APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

### Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
30	13	0	13	0

### Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
<p>The Laurels Browns Spring Potten End Berkhamsted</p> <p>Hertfordshire HP4 2SQ</p>	<p>We object to this proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed narrow access road to the site makes it unsafe for its residents and service providers to enter or exit at its junction with Water End Road. We already experience safety issues with the junction of Browns Spring and Water End Road whenever vehicles are parked in and around this junction, severely limiting safe access and visibility.</li> <li>2. The local sewage system cannot cope with the existing number of properties already connected to it, affecting the health and wellbeing of those in Browns Spring that suffer from sewerage overflows into their gardens and homes. The increasingly frequent attendance of pump trucks, and (foul smelling) temporary pipework left stacked in Browns Spring also makes it less pleasant for all us that live here.</li> <li>3. The number of properties squeezed onto the site would cause problems for the residents that occupied the site and the service operators that attend those properties, ie. waste collection, delivery trucks etc.</li> </ol> <p>We hope that due consideration will be given to all of the objections given by those who will have to live with your decision.</p>
<p>Puketaha Browns Spring Potten End Berkhamsted</p> <p>Hertfordshire HP4 2SQ</p>	<p>We wish to object to this application. Our property is on the very edge of this proposed site and will be over looked by houses 4, 5 and 6. The six houses on the plan appear to be in addition to an earlier application 19/03263/FUL by the same applicant to convert commercial buildings to a dwelling which has been granted. This should be taken into account when looking at the plot and any further development.</p> <p>In our view this site will be very overcrowded leading to much noise and pollution.</p> <p>These six houses will adjoin the existing sewerage system. Thames Water have huge problems with sewerage and at least five houses in Browns Spring are affected with sewerage in their gardens and more disgusting in their sinks and toilets. Thames Water tanker vehicles are in Browns Spring at least every three weeks emptying the sewerage. Additional houses will make this situation much worse.</p> <p>There is nothing on the plans to improve access. At present there is only one single vehicle access to this site. Water End Road is in the 30 miles an hour speeding limit although in reality the traffic is much faster.</p> <p>We would like you to take into account our objections when considering this application.</p>
<p>Springfield 25 Water End Road Potten End Berkhamsted</p>	<p>We have concerns regarding the suitability of the only access road, from Water End Road, to the site. Our drive-way shares a dropped curb/cross-over with both the entrance to this access and Water End Road. We believe the building of another 6 properties, coupled with the</p>

<p>Hertfordshire HP4 2SH</p>	<p>2 existing dwellings (and a future 3-bedroom property) would create increased traffic. Consequently, we are concerned that use of this access road may become hazardous, compromising road user safety. Whilst we appreciate the need for more local housing, the access road would not support the number of properties being proposed.</p>
<p>Woodbury Browns Spring Potten End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2SQ</p>	<p>The land is not big enough to support this type of development which will impact all the houses surrounding it. The access road is too small to deal with all the construction traffic and will cause distress to those residents who live in those houses adjacent to the site. The elevated position of the houses will also cause all the houses surrounding the land to be overlooked and residents' light and privacy to be compromised.</p> <p>Parking is limited on the site and so cars will be forced to park in the surrounding roads which are already at capacity.</p> <p>Noise levels from construction and then more families will seriously impact the health and well being of all the residents who are surrounding this site.</p> <p>Drainage is already compromised to all the houses on the Browns Spring side of the plans which have waterlogged gardens if there are several days of rain. The site is on a gradient which means the houses will have an elevated position affecting the run off from the site which will further impact gardens and ultimately properties.</p> <p>If granted this development will cause an additional strain on the small sewerage pump house and further impact the residents of Browns Springs who already have raw sewage coming up into their gardens. Thames Water pump out the drains and sewage from residents gardens several times a year and an added 6 houses waste water will further compromise these houses.</p> <p>Development permission in the past has always been turned down because of these issues and as nothing has changed to alleviate these problems this permission should be denied again.</p>
<p>Hill View Browns Spring Potten End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2SQ</p>	<p>We have lived at Hillview, Brown Spring for 25 years and always enjoyed the open field to the rear of our property. In fact, many of the houses in the road have created patio areas at the top of their gardens as this is where the last light of the day fades and is a lovely end to a summers evening.</p> <p>We are not naive though, and always thought one day a house would be built and possibly even two. When a small print-works was built 15+ years ago we knew at some stage it would be converted into a house with a nice garden. Sure enough, I believe planning has now recently been passed for this.</p> <p>But now plans are in for an additional six, yes you read that correctly, six properties to be built creating a new modern cul-de-sac with nine properties (2 existing, 1 approved and 6 additional). This is pure greed without any consideration of anything other than profit. Totally inappropriate, and I list my points below.</p> <p>This is an awkward shaped plot with extremely narrow access (10 feet)</p>

beside the old Fox Inn. This area was the original centre of the village with the Olde Bakery and Elm Tree Cottages set sideways to Water End Road. These are all thought to be at least 18th century and possibly earlier. Currently there are two properties down this narrow access with the proposed conversion of the print-works making this three. A fire engine alone is 8 feet wide, excluding its wing mirrors. The properties furthest down the new development are three, 3 bedrooomed terraces which by definition will have 12 or more occupants in the same structure, all at risk. Even if the fire is in the three, 2 bedrooomed houses we have a probable minimum of 9 occupants. This area of land is completely landlocked with no other access, all delivery traffic, construction, emergency and residents will travel up and down this 10-foot-wide gap. When complete the traffic flow will increase a minimum of 10-fold.

#### The Precedent - Chalk and Cheese

The precedent for this for this new development is, I believe, the construction of only 5 properties built to the rear of Rambling Way This is a cul-de-sac off a cul-de-sac and a plot nearly twice the size. The access off Rambling Way is 18 foot wide (almost double) with clear vision along this road to where it widens.

These properties are considerately placed along the centre of the plot meaning rear gardens, back on to the rear gardens of similar sized properties.

However....

The access road to Mr Grooms proposed development leads on to a busy main road. If a car is waiting to come out a car cannot enter and visa versa. If a car enters the access point it cannot see outbound traffic as this bends sharply to the left at the bottom giving no visual warning of traffic approaching. There will be a high incidence of cars having to reverse back onto the main road into fast flowing traffic. This is at a bend in the road and will result in road accidents.

And another thing or two...

These are shoe-horned in to get the most return, overdevelopment beyond any reason. Our personal property will be looked down upon with a sheer brick wall right up against our fence line. I cannot believe they can get 3, 3 bedroom houses across a strip of land barely 70 foot wide!! They then have the cheek to show on the plans a line of mature trees between us, do not be fooled. There is nothing there currently and we have a wall 1 foot inside out boundary so root invasion will dictate a minimum distance for any planting. It is just too close, our property slopes uphill so the effected is exaggerated and loss of amenity is immense. Any overlooking will be directly into our first-floor bedrooms.

With 7 new properties, potentially 14 cars and dozens of people the noise pollution will be inevitable on such a tiny plot. The fact that the density is way over the existing norm for this area means the character will be dramatically changed.

Browns Spring has always been the end of the line for sewerage for this half of the village. The truth is the system just cannot take anymore and regularly overflows into the gardens below us. With the redevelopment

	<p>of the house on the corner to three properties, the bus garage to two houses and now Rambling Ways additional five, it really is at breaking point. To place another 14 toilets and seven bathrooms onto the system is madness. At least 10 times a year Thames Water currently run their disgusting pipes up the road and alleyway to pump away goodness knows what.</p> <p>In short, I don't oppose development and affordable housing is needed but this is insane. Let us remember that once it is done it cannot be undone, the developers walk away. It is our duty to ensure that an appropriate and properly researched solution is found that gives the owner a good return but isn't to the detriment of the existing residents.</p>
<p>Dunromin Browns Spring Potten End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2SQ</p>	<p>I wish to object to this application. My property adjoins the boundary of this site. The six proposed houses are in addition to an earlier application 19/03263/FUL in the same location to convert commercial buildings to a dwelling which has been granted. This should be taken into account with this new application.</p> <p>The proposed site adjoins my garden and is a 90cms elevation above my property. This will cause loss of amenity overlooking my garden and property. Pollution from vehicles will be a problem when using my outdoor space.</p> <p>The elevated site with occupants using external water, water run-off from gardens etc will cause extra flow into adjoining properties below the site.</p> <p>Browns Spring has a long-standing problem with sewerage. Potten End sewerage is inadequately served by an outdated pumping station requiring intensive, monthly pumping assistance by Thames Water. Five houses in Browns Spring are affected whereby sewage backs up and flows into their gardens along with blocked waste water in sinks and toilets. Further development will exacerbate this unacceptable situation.</p> <p>There is only a single vehicle access to the site. Vehicles would enter and exit onto the bend of the busy Water End Road. Additional traffic negotiating this area is likely to cause problems. There is nothing on the plans to improve this access.</p> <p>I should be grateful if you would take into account my points of objection when considering this application.</p>
<p>Longview Browns Spring Potten End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2SQ</p>	<p>I object to this application on the basis of the additional pressure the development would place on the already overstretched sewerage system at this end of the village. Some houses in Browns Spring regularly suffer from raw sewage in their garden because the system cannot cope as it is, let alone with 6 additional properties. It surely cannot be acceptable to add to the pressure on the system, and increase the frequency of these dangerous and distressing sewage overflows, until the current sewage problem has been resolved. Like many Browns Spring residents, I recognise the need for more affordable housing but the density of this development on such a small plot, and the effect this will have on a sewage system that simply cannot cope with the existing housing, makes me really concerned about this application.</p>

	<p>We are also concerned about the loss of the line of trees and bushes that border Mr Groom's field and the back gardens of the affected Browns Spring properties. These trees teem with birds, who nest there and use them as staging posts to our bird feeders, and provide cover for foxes, hedgehogs and bats. After decades of national and local ecological decline, and dramatically reduced bird and wild mammal numbers due to habitat loss, it is really important that even these small corridors of habitat are maintained or replaced with appropriate, native tree and hedge species that encourage diverse wildlife. On the plans, it is not clear what hedge or trees are planned on the border, but making sure these are wildlife friendly would make a big difference to the environmental impact of this development. The Browns Spring gardens are not big enough for trees which makes the trees at the back really important for the birds.</p> <p>The current line of trees also provide a dense enough natural screen which is important in ensuring the Browns Spring properties are not overlooked.</p> <p>We are concerned about the loss of the line of trees and bushes that border Mr Groom's field and the back gardens of the affected Browns Spring properties. These trees teem with birds, who nest there and use them as staging posts to our bird feeders, and provide cover for foxes and hedgehogs and other mammals. After decades of national and local ecological decline, and dramatically reduced bird and wild mammal numbers due to habitat loss, it is really important that even these small corridors of habitat are maintained or replaced with appropriate, native tree and hedge species that encourage diverse wildlife. On the plans, it is not clear what hedge or trees are planned on the border, but making sure these are wildlife friendly would make a big difference to the environmental impact of this development. The Browns Spring gardens are not big enough for trees which makes the trees at the back really important for the birds.</p> <p>The current line of trees also provide a dense enough natural screen which is important in ensuring the Browns Spring properties are not overlooked.</p>
<p>19 Water End Road  Potten End  Berkhamsted  Hertfordshire  HP4 2SH</p>	<p>After receiving confirmation of 21/04555/FUL, we are extremely concerned for a number of reasons:</p> <p>Loss of light/Overshadowing</p> <p>We are particularly concerned at the loss of light that we will encounter if the buildings are built in the land behind ours. The photo attached also shows trees which would indeed add to this issue.</p> <p>Overlooking/Loss of Privacy</p> <p>Any 2-storey building behind our property will have a direct line of sight into our Garden and thus our patio widows. This will remove any privacy that we have currently and will be very upsetting for us.</p> <p>Visual Intrusion</p>



	<p>While the attaching plans show a sliver of land without properties built on them, they will be an eye sore and will have a detrimental effect to the aesthetics of the area, let alone the value of our home.</p>
<p>13 Water End Road Potten End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2SH</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons.</p> <p>Firstly the development is directly adjoining our property and the building works will cause a significant noise nuisance and disruption whilst in progress. Once complete, the new houses will be located directly next to our outdoor area and indoor living space and the extra people and vehicles this site will accommodate will also increase noise and pollution levels. Following the building works it will be highly likely that our views of the surrounding landscape will be obstructed and as our premises will without doubt be overlooked, both our house and garden privacy will be compromised. It will reduce the value of our and other properties in the area due to it being overcrowded. I am also concerned about the strain the development will have to the local amenities, I am aware that residents of Brown Spring suffer with drainage/flooding issues and 6 further houses will only add to this issue. I am concerned the already stretched utilities will not cope with such a large overdevelopment in the small area proposed. The site will also attract several more vehicles and at busy times will encourage parking on the main road, mostly on the pavement, this will cause obstruction to the traffic flow and cause further risk of accidents along this stretch of the road. The pavements and roadway are already narrow along this stretch and pedestrians are often forced to walk in the carriageway. I also feel the only access for the site is inadequate for the building traffic and after development the further vehicles the site will bring. There are also a number of old and established outbuildings on our property which are likely to be damaged significantly from the building work as a result of long term unmaintained upkeep of foliage growth from the site which has knitted itself into the roofs and brickwork of these outbuildings.</p> <p>Furthermore, I feel that it is important to mention that development of this site will have a detrimental impact on the ecology which has been allowed to thrive and use adjoining residents premises for at least 20 years. Existing wildlife (badgers, hedgehogs, bats) habitats will be eradicated in order to make way for unwanted development. 6 houses on this small plot of land will significantly overdevelop the area. Potten End is a small quiet village location and this is the reason we moved here. 6 further houses stuffed into this space is not in keeping with the current environment and will overpopulate this small area. Recent residential properties have already been added very close to this site.</p> <p>I think this development will have a significant detrimental impact on the existing residents and we are deeply concerned on the impact it will have on us as a family and the quality of our life for the reasons outlined above. We ask that you carefully consider our concerns raised in relation to this proposal.</p>

<p>Jenady Water End Road Potten End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2SH</p>	<p>Whilst we would not be against new houses in Potten End or new neighbours, as we were fully aware of the proposed 3 bed bungalow in the same area of land, we object to these plans on grounds of access, parking and pollution:</p> <p>The narrow unlit single lane, without a footpath, will not sustain both formerly the additional construction traffic and latterly the residential traffic and their visitors.</p> <p>The access road has no passing places or a footpath and poses a serious risk to pedestrians. The end of the lane is a hazardous junction and so the vehicle access for an extra 6 houses will cause disruption and congestion- reversing vehicles onto water end road would be dangerous to any approaching vehicles.</p> <p>Furthermore, the lane (beyond the outlined development site) does not offer any additional parking and so overflow parking on Water End Road will add obstacles and further traffic on an already busy road without any form of traffic calming, eg. a safety camera system, operating to manage speeding.</p>
<p>Lilydale Browns Spring Potten End Berkhamsted</p> <p>Hertfordshire HP4 2SQ</p>	<p>These additional houses will have to be connected to an already overburdened local sewage network that has regularly flooded a number of gardens in the area with raw sewage. The line that they will be connected to is particularly prone to blockages and the small pumping station is not able to cope during very high rainfall already. Any additional surface water (off roofs, drives, patios) not going into purpose built soakaways cannot currently be accommodated by the village waste water system and will cause sewage flooding.</p>
<p>Beechcroft Browns Spring Potten End Berkhamsted</p> <p>Hertfordshire HP4 2SQ</p>	<p>As Brown's Spring residents we wish to object to the proposed development.</p> <p>Water End Road is a dangerous road in good weather conditions and even more so in the evenings and winter, and even though it is subject to a 30mph speed limit, vehicles regularly exceed this. Therefore, a narrow site entrance and exit on a bend is a recipe for disaster. Potten End is already subject to ongoing traffic problems due to accidents on Water End Road.</p> <p>Brown's Spring is subject to problems relating to inadequate drainage of sewerage. The proposal seeks to add to the burden of the already strained capacity.</p> <p>It is also a worry that the village is being subjected to shoe-horning homes into the most inadequate of sites and even more inadequate access.</p> <p>Although we appreciate new homes need to be built, we feel this is not the safest nor most practical site. We also feel we are at risk of losing the character of the village.</p>
<p>The Coppice</p>	<p>I would like to object to this proposal, the drain infrastructure this site</p>

<p>Browns Spring Potten End Berkhamsted</p> <p>Hertfordshire HP4 2SQ</p>	<p>would need to join is already wholly inadequate. It is a relatively small site and to shoe horn 6 houses onto it is totally disregarding the current residents quality of life. The pumping station needs to be upgraded, the pipes need constant maintenance and Thames water are highly ineffective. This will just add to the misery felt by various parts of this branch of the sewer network. Not to mention the noise, pollution, disruption and traffic flow not only during the build but afterwards.</p>
--	--