

**ITEM NUMBER: 5a**

|                               |  |                           |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| <b>23/02876/MPI</b>           | <b>Demolition of the existing school building and construction of new replacement school building with MUGA, all weather pitch, landscaping and parking</b>  |                           |
| <b>Site Address:</b>          | <b>Blessed Cuthbert Mayne Roman Catholic School Clover Way Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 3EA</b>   |                           |
| <b>Applicant/Agent:</b>       |  | <b>Mr Matthew Blythin</b> |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>          | <b>James Gardner</b>   |                           |
| <b>Parish/Ward:</b>           |  | <b>Gadebridge</b>         |
| <b>Referral to Committee:</b> | <b>Called-in by Ward Councillor Angela Mitchell over concerns in relation to noise from the proposed community facilities, safety of children passing the site on foot during the construction phase, and the potential for asbestos dust to travel through the air during demolition.</b> |                           |

**1. RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 The principle of the development of a replacement school on designated Open Land is acceptable in accordance with Policies CS4 and CS23 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and saved Policies 69 and 116 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), provided, amongst other things, that the buildings are well-related to existing development and the Open Land setting, and do not compromise the integrity and future of the Open Land.

2.2 In line with the above, consideration has been given to the positioning of the new school building and that its building line matches that of Gade Valley Primary School to the south. The result is that a north-south green corridor is retained, enabling the existing playing field to continue to be utilised. It is considered, therefore, that the development would be well-related to existing development and would not compromise the integrity of the Open Land.

2.3 Consideration has been given to matters appertaining to residential amenity, and it is noted that a number of objections have been received from local residents. In summary, subject to the inclusion of a number of planning conditions, it is concluded that the proposed development would comply with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy which seeks, amongst others things, to avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to surrounding properties.

2.4 Access to the site will remain unchanged and the internal re-configuration of the access road and parking is considered to be an improvement. The capacity of the school will not increase as result of the re-development; therefore, it follows that there will be no material increase in vehicular movements in relation to school activity post-construction. It is accepted that there would be some additional movements associated with the community use of the sports facilities; however, these would not be significant in terms of time or duration.

2.5 The development provides the requisite number of parking spaces for a school and overprovides by one space in terms of disabled parking, which is welcomed.

2.6 Given the constrained nature of Clover Way, construction access needs to be carefully considered. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) proposes the use of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) in order to restrict parking along much of Clover Way, facilitating

the safe and unhindered movement of construction traffic. It is understood that Hertfordshire Highways' Network Management Team are happy with this approach. Some elements of the CTMP need to be updated; therefore, notwithstanding that information has already been submitted, it is recommended that a condition requiring an updated CTMP be included with any grant of planning permission.

### **3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

3.1 The application site is designated as Open Land and has an area of approximately 1.4 hectares and is located within the New Town neighbourhood of Gadebridge. The school occupies the western side of the site and comprises of a split level building of single and two-storey construction. A Multi-Use-Games Area (MUGA) is located to the east of the school, proximate to the northern boundary, while the main school playing field occupies the land further to the east, bounding Gadebridge Park. Two-storey detached residential dwellings in Betjeman Way are located to the north of the site. The former Laureate Academy Sixth Form and Gade Valley School are located to the south. Levels fall across the site from east to west.

3.2 The school has two separate accesses. The main access is via Clover Way to the west which provides both pedestrian and vehicular access to a parking area at the front of the school. A secondary pedestrian access is located off Gadebridge Road and comprises of the car park of the former Laureate Academy Sixth Form<sup>1</sup>.

### **4. PROPOSAL**

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of all buildings currently on the site and the construction of a new school two-storey school building. The proposal also includes the construction of an Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) and Multi-Use-Games-Area (MUGA) for use by the school during school hours and by members of the public at other times.

4.2 Vehicular access to the site will continue to be from Clover Way but the proposal includes the re-arrangement of the internal vehicle and pedestrian accesses. A loop road is to be constructed which would accommodate traffic moving in a clockwise direction with a number of parent drop-off spaces located around the perimeter. Parking would also be re-configured to maximise the available space.

### **5. PLANNING HISTORY**

Planning Applications:

4/01698/16/FUL - Extension and alteration to existing school main entrance  
*WDN - 23rd August 2016*

4/00613/13/FUL - Installation of external lighting (amended scheme)  
*REF - 23rd May 2013*

4/00508/12/FUL - Fitting of dusk to dawn security lights  
*REF - 22nd May 2012*

4/00178/12/FUL - Installation of a wooden greenhouse  
*GRA - 9th July 2012*

4/01601/11/RET - Security lights (amended scheme)  
*WDN - 8th November 2011*

---

<sup>1</sup> It has been confirmed that the school has access / use rights in respect of this land.

4/00411/11/RET - Security lights  
REF - 3rd May 2011

4/01561/08/RET - Environmental reinforcing of existing grass parking area  
GRA - 6th November 2008

Appeals: None

## **6. CONSTRAINTS**

Advert Control: Advert Spec Control  
CIL Zone: CIL3  
Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish  
Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town ~~Village~~ (Hemel Hempstead)  
Residential Character Area: HCA6  
Parking Standards: New Zone 3  
EA Source Protection Zone: 2  
EA Source Protection Zone: 3  
Town: Hemel Hempstead

## **7. REPRESENTATIONS**

### Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

### Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

## **8. PLANNING POLICIES**

Main Documents:

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

Relevant Policies:

### Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013)

Policy NP1 - Supporting Development  
Policy CS1 - Distribution of Development  
Policy CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages  
Policy CS8 - Sustainable Transport  
Policy CS9 - Management of Roads  
Policy CS12 - Quality of Site Design  
Policy CS23 - Social Infrastructure  
Policy CS25 - Landscape Character  
Policy CS26 – Green Infrastructure  
Policy CS28 - Renewable Energy  
Policy CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction  
Policy CS31 - Water Management

Policy CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality

Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004)

Policy 51 - Development and Transport Impacts

Policy 54 - Highway Design

Policy 69 - Education

Policy 75 - Retention of Leisure Space

Policy 99 - Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands

Policy 111 - Height of Buildings

Policy 113 - Exterior Lighting

Policy 116 - Open Land in Towns and Large Villages

Appendix 8 – Exterior Lighting

Supplementary Planning Documents

BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2022)

Dacorum Parking Standards SPD (2020)

Refuse Storage Guidance Note (2015)

## **9. CONSIDERATIONS**

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;

The quality of design;

The impact on residential amenity; and

The impact on highway safety and car parking.

### **Principle of Development**

9.2 Policy CS4 guides development to the appropriate areas within settlements and highlights that development for community purposes is encouraged, provided it is compatible with its surroundings. It further states that in Open Land areas the primary planning purpose is to maintain the generally open character. Development proposals should therefore be assessed against relevant Open Land policies.

9.3 Policy CS23 encourages social infrastructure and supports new school facilities on Open Land. Saved Policy 69 of the Local Plan permits the redevelopment of existing institutional facilities (e.g. schools), including those in Open Land areas, providing that:

- (i) the environmental character of the location is retained;
- (ii) there is no significant detriment to residential amenity;
- (iii) sufficient on-site parking is provided;
- (iv) there is satisfactory provision for the setting down and picking up of students arriving by private or passenger transport;
- (v) ancillary facilities (including playing fields and grounds) are available to meet the needs of students; and

(vi) ancillary buildings and works, additional replacement and redevelopment of buildings and changes of use will be guided and controlled through the criteria in Policy 116.

9.4 Saved Policy 116 sets out that Open Land forming part of the urban structure will be protected from building and other inappropriate development. Replacement and redevelopment of buildings must be well-related to existing development and Open Land setting, and must not compromise the integrity and future of the Open Land.

9.5 Paragraph 99 (a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Local Planning Authorities should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications.

9.6 It is further noted that there is strong support for the development of state-funded schools in the 'Policy statement – planning for schools development' published by the Department for Communities and Local Government in August 2011.

9.7 As a result, the principle of development is supported. Considerations such as whether there would be significant detriment to residential amenity and whether sufficient on-site parking is provided will be considered later in this report.

#### *Impact on Open Land*

9.8 The Planning Statement provides the following comparison in respect of the existing and proposed schools:

|                        | <b>Existing (sqm)</b> | <b>Proposed (sqm)</b> |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| School Built Footprint | 1,138                 | 1,000                 |
| MUGA / AGP             | 1,408                 | 1,440                 |
| Hardplay Area          | 1,073                 | 950                   |
|                        |                       |                       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>           | <b>3,691</b>          | <b>3,390</b>          |

9.9 The proposal would result in a more consolidated main school building and reductions in overall built form across the site (excluding parking and access provision).

9.10 Consideration has been given to the positioning of the new school building and it is noted that the building line matches that of Gade Valley Primary School to the south. The result is that a north-south green corridor is retained, enabling the existing playing field to continue to be utilised.

9.11 Existing and proposed Site sections indicate that there would not be any significant difference in height between the existing and proposed buildings.

9.12 The site is relatively well contained and it is therefore unlikely that anything more than glimpsed views of the new building would be possible from nearby public vantage points. In fact, public views of the school would almost certainly be reduced; in particular, from Gadebridge Road. Views from the opposite side of the valley are considered unlikely given the limited height of the proposed building and the mature belt along the boundary of Gadebridge Park.

#### **Quality of Design**

9.13 The proposed development would result in the wholesale demolition of the buildings currently on the site and the construction of a new two-storey school block on a consolidated footprint.

9.14 To ensure that the school remains operational during the construction phase the new building is to be constructed further to the east and thus allow for an improved relationship with the adjacent school buildings, bringing them in line with one another and provide an element of coherence across the educational facilities. The new building would not, however, be located any closer to the northern boundary than the existing<sup>2</sup> building.

9.15 Pushing the school further back into the site would also result in an improved outlook for some of the classrooms<sup>3</sup> and imbue the area surrounding the car park with a more open aspect.

9.16 Whilst noting that the proposal would create a larger area of parking, drawing no. SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1004<sup>4</sup> shows a reasonable area of landscaping between the parking area and site boundary, while the integrated landscaped elements would soften the overall appearance of the hard surfaced area. A total of 36 new trees are to be planted, and it is important to note that none are located immediately adjacent to the site boundary<sup>5</sup>. Details of the specific species mix have not been provided at this stage; however, it is considered that this level of detail can be reserved by condition, ensuring that the species is suitable for its particular location.

9.17 The Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) and Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) are to be sited on the western side of the site to enable easy access for members of the public who may wish to use the facilities, and to provide a clear delineation between the secure school area and the semi-public areas.

9.18 The new school building would be considerably more compact in form than the somewhat sprawling building that currently occupies the site. It would be of two-storey construction and of similar height to the existing school building. The incorporation of setbacks, architectural detailing<sup>6</sup> and the application of contrasting materials is such that the mass and bulk of the building would be successfully broken up and result in a high quality appearance. In particular, the use of lighter and darker blue rendered panels is considered to add interest and is a welcomed feature.

9.19 The internal layout of the school is logical and each classroom would have multiple window openings, ensuring a good internal learning environment for future students.

9.20 It is worth noting that changes, full details of which are set out in the Statement of Community Involvement, were made to the plans following the consultation event held with local residents prior to the submission of this application. These include a reduction in tree planting along the northern boundary and the re-location of the contractor compound to the south-west, thereby limiting the impact on nos. 50 and 51 Betjeman Way.

### **Impact on Residential Amenity**

9.21 Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy seeks to ensure that, amongst other things, development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to surrounding properties.

9.22 Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan advises 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, with significant overshadowing to be avoided.

---

<sup>2</sup> As shown on drawing no. SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1005.

<sup>3</sup> At present, a number of classrooms on the western side of the site are located in close proximity to a close-boarded fence.

<sup>4</sup> Site Landscaping Plan 2.

<sup>5</sup> The proximity of trees and associated loss of light, lack of maintenance etc was a common element of concern raised by local residents.

<sup>6</sup> Aluminium louvres & contrasting render.

9.23 Whilst primarily aimed at mitigating the impacts of new residential development on existing residential development, the guidance found within Appendix 3 regarding the separation distances necessary to maintain an acceptable level of privacy are considered to provide a starting point from which a judgement can be made as to whether, as a matter of planning judgement, this is the case. In this regard, Appendix 3 states that residential development should be designed and laid out so that the privacy of existing and new residents is achieved, with a minimum distance of 23 metres between the main rear wall of a dwelling and the main wall (front or rear) of another being met in order to ensure privacy.

#### Noise and Disturbance

9.24 Planning Policy Guidance 24 (PPG24) guides local authorities in England on the use of their planning powers to minimise the adverse impact of noise. It outlines the considerations to be taken into account in determining planning applications both for noise-sensitive developments and for those activities which generate noise. PPG24 has, however, now been cancelled and superseded by the NPPF, and whereas PPG24 included a sequential test and Noise Exposure Categories, the NPPF is less prescriptive:

9.25 Paragraph 180 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- e) *Preventing new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.*

9.26 Furthermore, Paragraph 191 of the NPPF states that:

*Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:*

- a) *Mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life.*

9.27 Reference is made in the NPPF to the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) (Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs), within which two established concepts are applied to noise impacts; namely:

NOEL – No Observed Effect Level

This is the level below which no effect can be detected. In simple terms, below this level, there is no detectable effect on health and quality of life due to the noise.

LOAEL – Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level

This is the level above which adverse effects on health and quality of life can be detected.

9.28 Extending these concepts for the purpose of this Noise Policy Statement leads to the concept of a significant observed adverse effect level:

SOAEL – Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level

This is the level above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur

9.29 It should be noted, however, that none of the three levels referred to above are defined numerically and, in the case of the SOAEL, the NPSE makes it clear that the noise level is likely to vary depending upon the noise source, the receptor and the time of day.

9.30 Sport England has published a guidance document in relation to the assessment of artificial grass pitches. The document contains general information relating to noise emissions from pitches, including the likely level of noise that can be expected, the behaviour of noise emissions from such a pitch and suitable criteria for assessment.

9.31 The Sport England Guidance draws upon the World Health Organisation (WHO) 'Guidelines for Community Noise' published in 1999, which states of noise levels internally and externally in relation to dwellings:

*'To enable casual conversation indoors during daytime, the sound level of interfering noise should not exceed 35 dB LAeq. The maximum sound pressure level should be measured with the sound pressure meter set at "fast".'*

9.32 The guidance goes on to state that, based on a 15 decibel sound reduction of a partially open window, the noise level outside a residential property during the daytime about 1 metre from façades of living spaces should not exceed 50 dB LAeq<sup>7</sup>.

#### *Community Use of Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP)*

9.33 An acoustic assessment prepared by Bloc Consulting forms part of the application submission and proposes mitigation in the form of a 3.5m high acoustic fence along the western boundary of the AGP. Special shock absorbing weldmesh fencing is also proposed to be interposed between the acoustic fence and the pitch, avoiding the creation of additional noise from ball strikes.

9.34 With the above-referenced mitigation in place computer modelling<sup>8</sup> indicates that two identified residences at 10-15 Clover Way would experience sound levels in the region of 52dB, while the amenity areas and rear facades of the dwellings on Betjeman Way would experience noise levels in the 45dB to 50dB range.

9.35 The acoustic assessment concludes that noise levels will be controlled to within the 'Between LOAEL and SOAEL' assessment band<sup>9</sup>. In other words, the use of the AGP and MUGA would not result in significant adverse effects on health and quality of life.

9.36 The above notwithstanding, whilst arguably not unreasonable during the daytime and early evening, the operation of the AGP past the early evening period could be problematic. In particular, it is considered that the sudden, jarring sound associated with raised voices, ball strikes and changes in the rhythm of play would all be qualitatively different to background noise which is more consistent in nature – e.g. tyres on a tarmac road, aircraft engines etc. It is submitted, therefore, that a planning condition restricting the hours of operation for community use of the AGP would be required, with hours of usage for the community being limited to the following days and times:

|            |               |
|------------|---------------|
| Mon – Fri: | 09:00 – 19:00 |
| Saturday:  | 09:00 – 15:00 |
| Sunday:    | 10:00 – 13:00 |

9.37 Sport England were consulted on the proposed hours of operation and have confirmed that:

<sup>7</sup> Equivalent Continuous Sound Pressure Level.

<sup>8</sup> Carried out by Bloc Consulting.

<sup>9</sup> The acoustic assessment describes this in the following term: *'Sound levels are expected to be moderately higher than recommended. It would be recommended that the risk is mitigated where possible.'*



*‘there would still be sufficient opportunities for community use to deliver the benefits to sport outlined in our original response and for the school to generate revenue that could be used towards the maintenance of these facilities.’*

9.38 The position (no objection) set out in their formal response dated 15<sup>th</sup> December 2023 therefore still applies. Should Members be minded to approve the application with reduced hours of operations, Sport England would need to be re-consulted again; and, were they to object, the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2024 would apply; that is to say, there would be a legal requirement to refer the application to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.

#### *Community Use of Multi-Use-Games-Area (MUGA)*

9.39 The noise assessment sets out how the MUGA has been dealt with:

*The MUGA is intended to be essentially a ‘like-for-like replacement’ for the existing hard play area, where it will be used by children from the school only, with the potential for use in after school clubs up to 6pm. This has been confirmed by the school. For this reason, the MUGA has been omitted from the assessment of noise impact, where the nearby noise sensitive receptors are already subject to noise from children playing, and from the same location.*

9.40 The MUGA is, however, now proposed to be made available for community use.

9.41 It has been argued by the agent that the MUGA would be used for the same purposes as the existing hard-surfaced area and thus its operation will not be problematic. However, this approach is questioned on the basis of the following:

- The hard-surface area upon which the MUGA is to be constructed is unlikely to currently be used for competitive sport, as evidenced by the fact that it is built on a gradient, not marked out for sport and does not have fencing of appropriate height along the boundaries. At best, its use after school hours is likely to amount to a handful of students having a ‘kick-around’. Therefore, the approach that the existing and proposed use are analogous is called into question.
- Whereas the existing western boundary treatment comprises of a hedge that would absorb any ball impacts with minimal sound transmission, the proposed boundary treatment would be a 3m weldmesh fence, which itself could give rise to disturbance (through the strikes of hockey pucks and other sport-related projectiles).
- The hard-surface is not currently used on weekends.

9.42 It may be the case that the MUGA can indeed operate without detriment to the nearby properties, but there is insufficient evidence at this stage to reach a definitive conclusion in this regard. The MUGA will be used at a greater intensity than the existing informal hard-surface, have a different boundary treatment (one more likely to result in noise from impacts) and there will be cumulative impacts from the AGP.

9.43 As such, it is suggested that an appropriate way in which to address these concerns would be a condition requiring a further assessment to be carried out and, where appropriate, suitable additional mitigation being provided. The wording of the condition is as follows:

*Construction of the Multi-Use-Games-Area (MUGA) hereby approved shall not commence until a noise assessment, including a scheme of noise mitigation (if required), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall demonstrate how significant adverse effects from noise to nearby residential occupiers are to be avoided. The assessment shall have regard to, amongst other things, the cumulative impact of noise generated by the Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP).*

*The noise assessment and any required scheme of noise mitigation shall be prepared and compiled by an appropriately experienced and competent persons.*

*The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved noise assessment, including any noise mitigation measures identified as required, and the approved noise mitigation shall be implemented prior to first use of the MUGA and permanently retained thereafter.*

*Reason: In order to ensure that the neighbouring properties are not subjected to unacceptable levels of noise disturbance, in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).*

*INFORMATIVE: Where noise mitigation is identified as necessary and includes fencing in excess of 2m, a separate grant of planning permission for the fencing would be required.*

9.44 The hours of operation of the MUGA are to be informed by the results of the noise assessment. Condition 13 will require operating hours to be agreed prior to first use of the MUGA.

9.45 There is no reason to believe that noise impacts arising from the MUGA cannot be made acceptable with mitigation, and thus the use of condition is considered to be appropriate and reasonable.

#### *External Building Services*

9.46 The acoustic assessment prepared by Bloc Consulting also considers the potential impact on nearby residential premises from the installation of ground source heat pumps, an electrical substation, and air handling units on the roof above the food preparation area.

9.47 The substation would be located approximately 33m from the rear elevation of no. 50 Betjeman Way and 19m from both nos. 41 and 42 Betjeman Way. The air handling units would be located approximately 43m and 32m from the rear elevations of the same dwellings.

9.48 The target daytime rating level of 36dB referred to in the report is derived from the 'representative background sound level' during the day, which was measured to be 41dB and shown on the histogram on page 42 (figure 10). Table 3 on page 15 sets out the rationale behind the -5 dB rating level.

9.49 The predicted cumulative noise level from the Kitchen air handling units and substation during the daytime has been calculated as 31dB ( $22 + 6 + 3^{10}$ ). Since this would be below the target daytime rating level of 36dB, the assessment predicts that the impact would fall within the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level.

9.50 The target night time rating level of 27dB is referred to in the report is derived from the 'representative background sound level' during the night, which was measured as 32dB and shown on the histogram on page 43 (figure 11). Table 3 on page 15 sets out the rationale behind the -5 dB rating level.

9.51 The predicted noise level from the substation during the night<sup>11</sup> has been calculated as 25dB ( $16 + 6 + 3^{12}$ ). Since this would be below the target night time rating level of 27dB, the assessment predicts that the impact would fall within the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level.

9.52 Therefore, it is considered that the external building services would have a very limited impact, if any, on the residential amenity of nearby dwellings. Whilst concerns have been raised by local residents in terms of noise and disturbance, who have also requested that external building services

---

<sup>10</sup> See Table 17.

<sup>11</sup> The kitchen equipment is not anticipated to be in operation overnight.

<sup>12</sup> See Table 19.

be re-located to an alternative position within the site, it is submitted that this would be unreasonable and could not be justified in planning policy terms.

9.53 The acoustic report also addresses the potential impact of the proposed ground source heat pumps. The relevant section has been reproduced in full below for ease of reference:

*Ground source heat pumps are expected to be employed on the project. The plant for this equipment is further expected to be located internal to the Heat Source Plant Room on the ground floor. It should be noted that as opposed to air -source heat pumps (which can generate high noise levels), ground source heat pump systems do not present an introduction of a new external noise source. The ground loop for the system is located underground, and the pumps associated with the system are to be in an internal plant room. External noise emissions from this system are therefore expected to be minimal.*

#### *Internal Light Pollution*

9.54 The site is already developed and thus a certain level of light will already be emitted from the existing buildings.

9.55 The windows most likely to result in disturbance to neighbouring properties are the three on the northern elevation serving the assembly hall. Whilst a number of dwellings within the Betjeman Way estate would potentially be able to see the illuminated windows of the assembly hall, it is no. 40 which is most likely to be affected. However, due to the interposition of no. 41 Betjeman Way, it is unlikely that the assembly hall windows would be visible from the ground floor of no. 40. It is acknowledged that views from first floor level may be possible, and that the canopy of the mature tree in the rear garden of no. 39 cannot be relied upon to form a permanent and effective barrier; therefore, further consideration is given to this matter below:

- It is not unreasonable to assume that a habitable room would be fitted with curtains or blinds so as to avoid the occupants being woken by sunrise in the summer months.
- The internal lighting configuration for the assembly hall is shown on drawing no. ZG-DWG-0002311369-0GF-R01-241023 and indicates that the lighting would be directed downwards from the ceiling, thereby avoiding any direct light glare into the windows of no. 40.
- Even taking into account the potential for community use of the hall, this would be unlikely to extend beyond 10pm.

9.56 Turning to the impact on no. 42 Betjeman Way, it is instructive to note that its flank wall is angled toward the northern elevation and contains a single window, which is understood to serve a non-habitable room (i.e. en-suite). Accordingly, only very limited weight would generally be given to any adverse impacts, such as they are, to this window.

9.57 The main rear elevation of no. 41 Betjeman Way is angled away from the northern elevation of the proposed school building. Thus, similar consideration to those referenced above in respect of no. 42 apply.

#### *Parking*

9.58 Drop-off will continue to take place in the car park to the south of the site, which formerly served the Laureate Academy Sixth Form. The new loop road will only be used by staff, of which there will be no increase in numbers, when they arrive in the morning and leave in the evening. Children arriving at school later in the day will be permitted to be dropped off using this new facility, though such instances are likely to be limited, and as such, there is unlikely to be a material increase in traffic movements and, by extension, it is not considered that there would be a material increase in noise and disturbance in this regard.

#### *Refuse Storage Area*

9.59 The current informal bin store is located in a similar position to that proposed as part of this application, sitting approximately 11m from the boundary of nos. 41 and 42 Betjeman Way and 18-20m from the rear elevations. It is not therefore considered that it would result in any disturbance over and above that already experienced.

Conclusion:

9.60 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the submitted acoustic report and has not raised any objections or concerns. He has also confirmed that acoustic report follows best practice, is fit for purpose and follows the relevant standards.

9.61 Subject to the imposition of planning conditions limiting the hours of operation of the AGP and MUGA, and securing the implementation and retention of the acoustic fence, it is not considered that noise and disturbance arising from the proposed development would result in any significant detriment to the amenity of nearby residential premises.

### Visual Intrusion

9.62 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.

#### *Impact on No. 38 Betjeman Way*

9.63 The new school building would be located approximately 30m from the rear elevation of no. 38 and not directly in front of any rear-facing windows<sup>13</sup>, ensuring an open aspect across the school playing fields is retained. The elevational treatment on the northern elevation of the school building is proposed to be a mixture of buff brick and light cream render, the effect of which would be to break up the massing and limit the visual impact. Accordingly, it is not considered that the development would be visually intrusive.

#### *Impact on No. 41 Betjeman Way*

9.64 The siting of this dwelling is such that the rear elevation is angled away from the flank wall of the new school building and thus would afford only a very oblique view. Coupled with the considerable degree of separation (29m), it is not considered that the proposed development would be visually intrusive.

#### *Impact on No. 42 Betjeman Way*

9.65 Due to the flank elevation facing the application site only containing a single (non-habitable) window, it is not considered that there would be any harmful levels of visual intrusion.

### Loss of Sunlight and Daylight

#### *Impact on Internal Levels of Daylighting*

9.66 Notwithstanding the considerable distance from the nearest dwellings and the relatively modest nature of the school building – i.e. two-storey construction and not excessive depth – the development has been assessed by the architects against the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice'.

---

<sup>13</sup> The structure shown on drawing no. SRP1148-NOV-00-00-D-A-PL04 as extending across part of the plot of no. 38 relates to a lightweight canopy which would not have any significant physical presence.

9.67 The Design and Access Statement, quoting the BRE guidance, states that if the distance of the new development is more than three times its height above the lowest window, daylight is unlikely to be affected. It then goes on to confirm that the overall height of the building (9.557m) is more than three times the distance to the nearest dwellings (i.e. > 28.671m). However, the Design and Access Statement acknowledges that the proposed building level is to be set at the same level as the existing MUGA, which occupies a higher level than nos. 38 and 41 Betjeman Way, and thus carries out a further review of the potential impact of daylighting levels by way of the 25-degree rule. This consists of measuring the angle to the horizontal subtended by the new development, at the level of the centre of the lowest window. If this angle is less than 25 degrees for the whole of the development, then it is unlikely to have a substantial effect on the diffuse skylight enjoyed by the existing building. The analysis concludes that the 25 degree rule would be passed.

9.68 Based upon the information set out it is unlikely that the development would result in any substantial impact on daylighting to habitable windows.

#### *Overshadowing*

9.69 A shadowing analysis has been conducted, the results of which are shown on pages 12-16 of the Design and Access Statement. It can be established that the proposed school building would give rise to a greater level of overshadowing to the rear gardens of nos. 41 and 42 Betjeman Way in December than the existing building, although it is instructive to note that there would be no appreciable increase in overshadowing in either March or June. By extension, other summer months would be similarly subject to little, if any, overshadowing.

9.70 In summary, given the limited level of overshadowing, its short-lived nature, and the fact that it would occur in a month generally not considered conducive to sitting out one's garden, it is submitted that, on balance, the effects are considered acceptable from a planning perspective.

#### *Loss of Privacy*

9.71 Five windows are shown on the northern (flank) elevation of the proposed building and would face the rear elevations of nos. 38, 41 and 42 Betjeman Way. This notwithstanding, there are, it is submitted, a number of factors which militate against any significant adverse impacts:

- Three of these windows are to serve a double height assembly hall and therefore no views would be possible under ordinary circumstances<sup>14</sup>.
  - (i) In the limited number of instances whereby unrestricted views from the assembly hall windows are possible, the distance to the rear elevations of the dwellings in question would be in the region of 29 – 33m.
  - (ii) Due to their height from the finished floor level, the inherent difficulties associated with spending any protracted period of time gazing out of these windows should not be underestimated.
  - (iii) The relationship between the proposed building and the aforementioned dwellings is not direct; rather, it would be oblique.
- Of the remaining two windows, one would comprise of a half-glazed door serving the kitchen and located at ground level, where existing boundary treatment would circumscribe views. The second window would be located at first floor level and serve a small Special Educational Need (SEN) Resource space, but would be set approximately 40m away from the site boundary.

---

<sup>14</sup> The exception to this would be when interior cleaning is undertaken.

9.72 In terms of the windows on the western (front) elevation, these would afford only oblique views of nos. 50 – 53 Betjeman Way and from a considerable distance<sup>15</sup>, such that there would be no significant level of overlooking. This is in contrast to the current situation where a clear-glazed door at first floor affords views of the rear elevation of no. 50 Betjeman Way from a distance of approximately 24m.

9.73 It is submitted that the factors listed above demonstrate that there would not be significant adverse impacts on dwellings located on Betjeman Way in terms of loss of privacy.

9.74 The windows located on the western (front) elevation of the proposed school building would be located over 80m away from the flats on Clover Way and thus clearly provide a sufficient level of privacy. In fact, the new school building would result in a marked improvement in privacy as it would be located considerably further away from the Clover Way flats than the existing school building.

Conclusion:

9.75 The proposed development would not result in any significant detriment to nearby properties in terms of visual intrusion, overshadowing, loss of sunlight and daylight or loss of privacy. It is acknowledged that there would be some limited additional overshadowing of the rear gardens of nos. 41 and 42 Betjeman Way during the winter months; however, this is not considered to be so severe as to weigh in favour of a refusal of planning permission, especially in light of the significant public benefit arising from this development.

### **Highway Safety and Car Parking**

#### **Highway Safety**

9.76 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.

9.77 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.

9.78 No changes are proposed to the access into the site from the highway, though the proposals do include the rearrangement of the internal vehicle and pedestrian accesses. A loop road is to be constructed which would accommodate traffic moving in a clockwise direction with a number of parent drop-off spaces located around the perimeter. It is understood that these will be used only in instances where children are late arriving at school. Drop-off at normal school times will continue to take place within the car park of the former Laureate Academy to the south, which appears to operate successfully.

9.79 As the number of students or staff is not proposed to be increased as a result of the proposals, it is not considered that the impacts from the proposal from a trip generation perspective on the surrounding highway network would be significant or severe.

#### ***Construction Traffic***

9.80 Like many other parts of the New Town, Clover Way suffers from a lack of off-road parking provision. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) proposes the use of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) in order to restrict parking along much of Clover Way, facilitating the

---

<sup>15</sup> Approximately 54m from the centre of the northern-most window of the SEN room to the rear elevation of no. 50 Betjeman Way.

safe movement of construction traffic. Both sides of Clover Way would not be subject to the restrictions and thus there would be scope for some parking. It is appreciated that this will not be convenient for local residents and that the disruption would subsist for much of the construction period.

9.81 With this in mind, the developers were asked to explore the possibility of providing temporary parking for local residents on the amenity green on the western side of Clover Way<sup>16</sup>. However, investigations have established that a UK Power Network cable serving the school is located below this verge. Furthermore, Hertfordshire Highways have expressed concerns in relation to the limited distance between the access point for the potential parking spaces and the junction with Gadebridge Road, which could pose a risk to highway safety. While it is true that unauthorised parking currently takes place on this verge, the Council would not want to condone unsafe parking practices that could ultimately lead to a road traffic accident.

9.82 The CTMP has evolved during the course of the application process and ten contractor parking spaces are now to be provided within the former Laureate Academy Sixth Form car park, further reducing pressure on local on-street parking. Contractors unable to park in the above-referenced car park will be directed to use the car park adjacent to the Bury and to not park on surrounding residential roads.

9.83 The TTRO is subject to a separate consent administered via Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) who are understood to be generally supportive of this approach.

#### *Servicing Access*

9.84 The Parking Standards SPD states that:

*'In relation to servicing, applicants will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate provision and space within the site for the parking, manoeuvring, loading and unloading to meet the operational servicing requirements of the development. The space set aside for servicing should be of suitable size for the type and quantity of vehicles likely to be associated with the development. Delivery vehicles should be able to safely enter and exit the site in a forward gear.'*

9.85 Appendix C of the Transport Statement prepared by DHA includes swept path analysis in respect of an 11.4m refuse freighter and demonstrates that it would be able to manoeuvre within the site and exit in a forward gear.

9.86 The position of the refuse storage area is such that waste operatives would be able to get within a reasonably convenient distance of it.

#### *Emergency Services Access*

9.87 Hertfordshire Fire and Rescue have reviewed the application and, subject to a Fire Brigade override button on the gates being provided, have not raised any concerns with regard to fire access. A condition is recommended for inclusion with any grant of planning permission.

#### Car Parking

9.88 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.

---

<sup>16</sup> This is already subject to unauthorised parking,

9.89 Matters pertaining to parking provision fall within the remit of the local planning authority, although the Highway Authority may make specific comments where car parking would undermine sustainability objectives (by discouraging the utilisation of more sustainable means of travel), or where a shortfall may exacerbate local conditions to such a degree that the free flow of traffic or highway safety would be prejudiced.

9.90 The Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 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.

9.91 Developments seeking provision above or below the standard are required to produce evidence acceptable to the council.

9.92 Appendix A outlines the standard expected for non-residential educational establishments as follows:

- 1 space per full-time member of staff
- 1 space per 100 pupils
- 1 space per 8 pupils over 17 years old
- 1 space per 20 pupils under 17 years old

9.93 Based upon the available information, it is calculated that a total of 25 spaces would be required to serve the development. The relevant plans indicate that 25 spaces are to be provided and therefore overall parking provision is in accordance with the Parking Standards SPD.

#### *Disabled Parking*

9.94 The school does not currently have a good supply of disabled parking and thus the redevelopment of the site represents an opportunity to address this deficiency.

9.95 Paragraph 6.16 of the Parking Standards SPD states that disabled parking spaces specified are part of the total provision, not additional. The relevant standard is for 1 disabled space to be provided per employee who is disabled<sup>17</sup> plus 6% of the total provision.

9.96 The application drawings indicate that three parking spaces are to be provided – against a requirement for two spaces. The overprovision of one space is minimal and amounts to a very modest public benefit.

9.97 Guidance on the dimensions of disabled car parking bays is provided in Traffic Advisory Leaflet 5/95:

*Off-Street Parking - The dimensions of off-street parking bays should provide a rectangle at least 4800mm long by 2400mm wide for the vehicle, along with additional space as follows: (a) where the bays are marked parallel to the access aisle and access is available from the side, an extra length of at least 1800mm (Figure 3), or (b) where the bays are marked perpendicularly to the access aisle, an additional width of at least 1200mm along each side. Where bays are adjacent, space can be saved by using the 1200mm "side" area to serve the bays on both sides (Figure 4).*

9.98 The disabled spaces shown on the plan comply with the above-referenced guidance and are therefore considered acceptable and fit for purpose.

#### *Electric Vehicle Charging*

---

<sup>17</sup> It has been confirmed by the agent that none of the current staff are registered disabled.



9.99 The EV charging provision requirements for planning purposes are set out in Table 1 on page 32 of the Parking Standards SPD, an extract of which has been provided below for ease of reference:

| Land use  | Provision  | Type of Charger (minimum)  | Power Supply  |
|---|--|--|---|
| Commercial Development (Offices / Employment Retail / Leisure Uses) B8 and C1 and former Use Classes B1,B2, D1, D2, A1, A2-A5, now Use Classes E, F1, F2 and Sui Generis as appropriate | 1 active charging point per 5 parking spaces provided, 20-30% of all remaining parking spaces to have passive provision (as specified in SPD standards table Appendix A) | 1 active charging point per 5 parking spaces provided, 20-30% of all remaining parking spaces to have passive provision (as specified in SPD standards table Appendix A) | 230v AC 32 Amp<br>Single Phase<br>dedicated supply<br>Rapid chargers 400v AC 100Amp<br>Triple Phase<br>dedicated supply<br>230v AC 32 Amp<br>Single Phase<br>dedicated supply |

9.100 25 parking spaces are to be provided, therefore, there would be a requirement for five EV chargers to be provided.

9.101 The submitted drawings indicate that five EV Pod Point EV chargers are to be provided and are therefore considered to be acceptable.

9.102 There is a further requirement that 20 – 30% of all remaining parking spaces have passive EV provision.

9.103 Passive provision is defined in the SPD as follows:

*Passive provision for electric vehicles: the network of cables and power supply necessary so that at a future date a socket can be added easily. It is significantly cheaper and less disruptive to install the underlying infrastructure for EV charge points during construction than to retrofit later.*

9.104 The plans do not provide any clarity in this regard; however, it has been confirmed by the agent that this is not an issue, and as such, it is recommended that a condition requiring details (and construction) of the passive EV provision be included with any grant of planning permission.

### **Other Material Considerations**

#### *EIA Development*

9.105 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 sets out the thresholds and criteria for the purposes of the definition of Schedule 2 development.

9.106 The relevant section has been reproduced below for ease of reference:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <i>10. Infrastructure projects</i>  |  |
| (a) Industrial estate development projects;   | The area of the development exceeds 0.5 hectare.   |
| (b) Urban development projects, including the construction of shopping centres and car parks, sports stadiums, leisure centres and multiplex cinemas; | (i) The development includes more than 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development; or<br>(ii) the development includes more than 150 dwellings; or<br>(iii) the overall area of the development exceeds 5 hectares. |

9.107 Where a project is listed in Schedule 2 and exceeds the relevant thresholds or criteria set out in the second column, the proposal will need to be screened by the local planning authority in order to determine whether significant effects on the environment are likely.

9.108 Taken as a whole, the total site area would exceed 1 hectare (approximately 1.4ha); however, the area which is actually to be developed would equate to less than 1 hectare. It is only when the playing fields to the east are included that the site area would exceed the relevant threshold.

9.109 There is also the wider question of whether the proposed development should be classified as an urban development project.

9.110 It is relevant to note that all of the developments listed in paragraph 10 (a) – (p) of Schedule 2 refer to infrastructure projects. Indeed, Paragraph 10 (b) set out above gives examples of urban development projects – i.e. construction of shopping centres and car parks, sports stadiums, leisure centres and multiplex cinemas.

9.111 The case of *R (Crematoria Management Ltd) v Welwyn Hatfield BC [2018]* provides further guidance. In particular, the judge held that although the interpretation of regulations or policy is matter for the courts, where the words to be construed are wide in ambit or imprecise in meaning, judgement is necessary in applying them to the facts of a particular case. As such, it is not inconceivable that different decision makers, confronted with identical or similar facts, could lawfully apply the policy or legislation differently.

9.112 It was further considered that the phrase “urban development project” could not be given a precise meaning, although a useful starting point would be the dictionary definition of “urban” - i.e. relating to or characteristic of a town or city. This notwithstanding, the court acknowledged that a variety of other factors would be relevant to that assessment, including the nature, size, and location of the development and the use to which it would be put.

9.113 The examples of urban development projects set out in paragraph 10 (b) differ considerably to the development proposed by this application. Whilst schools can be a characteristic of towns (i.e. urban environments), they are not an uncommon feature in small villages and countryside locations. The use of the site would not change as a result of the propose development; nor would it result in a material intensification of the use.

Conclusion:

9.114 Based upon the information available, it is not considered that the development falls within the definition of an urban development project.

### *Ecology*

9.115 The application has been reviewed by Hertfordshire Ecology who have had regard to the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) prepared by Urban Green and the Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys carried out by Thomson Environmental Consultants.

9.116 According to the bat report a total of five trees<sup>18</sup> were assessed to have potential for roosting bats, but only two of them are proposed to be felled – T12 & T18. However, these trees are not

---

<sup>18</sup> G9 (2), T12, T18, T20.

shown for removal on the Tree Removal Plan<sup>19</sup>, nor are they listed on the Tree Works Schedule<sup>20</sup>. Clarification was subsequently sought from the agent who confirmed that they are not scheduled for felling. As such, there is no need to include a condition requiring soft felling; instead, a separate condition in relation to tree protection and retention will ensure that these trees are in any case retained.

9.117 The PEA also identified that the site has the potential to contain badgers, hedgehogs and nesting. Hertfordshire Ecology have therefore recommended that the proposed mitigation for hedgehogs be secured by way of planning condition. Given the inherent difficulties in detecting whether a breach of the mitigation has, in fact, occurred, it is unlikely that the condition would meet the test of enforceability and thus these matters would be best addressed by way of informatives appended to the decision notice.

### *Lighting*

9.118 The documentation submitted by the applicant has been reviewed by the Council's lighting specialist, who has requested further information. To date this information has not been provided and therefore it would be appropriate to preclude all external lighting by condition until such point as appropriate information has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

### *Trees*

9.119 According to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) five trees are proposed to be felled in order to facilitate to the new development. These are identified on the Tree Removal Plan as T10, T11, T21, T22 and T24. The Tree Works Schedule from the AIA is included below for ease of reference:

| Tree Works Schedule |                                  |              |   |                                |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Tree Number         | BS 5837: 2012 Retention Category | Species      | Works Required  | Reason                         |
| T10                 | A                                | Silver birch | Fell to ground level, grind or grub out the stumps to a depth of 0.2m | To facilitate the development. |
| T11                 |                                  | Cherry plum  |   |                                |
| T21                 |                                  | Ash          |   |                                |
| T22                 | C                                | Rowan        |   |                                |
| T24                 | B                                | Field maple  |   |                                |

9.120 Whilst the loss of the Category A trees is regrettable, these removals are necessary in order to facilitate the development. Furthermore, it is also to be noted that a total of 36 new trees are proposed to be planted as part of wider site improvements, which, on balance, is considered acceptable.

9.121 Notwithstanding the above, an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) does not form part of the application submission. The document is important as its purpose is to provide solutions and working methods that address the potential impacts identified in the AIA. Accordingly, a condition requiring the submission and approval of an AMS is proposed to be included with any grant of planning permission.

### *Land Contamination*

9.122 The Council's Scientific Officer has reviewed the application and, subject to the imposition of conditions requiring further investigation, does not wish to object to the application.

9.123 The Environment Agency have requested that a condition precluding piling and other types of intrusive groundworks - such as the installation of ground source heat pumps - be included with any grant of planning permission, as these types of development have the potential to create new pollutant linkages, potentially resulting in the deterioration of groundwater quality beneath the site.

<sup>19</sup> Page 25 of Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

<sup>20</sup> Page 24 of Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

9.124 Both sets of condition are considered reasonable and are recommended to be included with any grant of planning permission.

#### *Flood Risk and Drainage*

9.125 The application has been supported by a Drainage Strategy Statement prepared by Calcinotto Civil and Structural Engineers.

9.126 The drainage strategy outlines that the site is wholly located within Flood Zone 1 for Rivers and Sea and is at a very low risk from surface water flooding.

9.127 The proposed method of draining the site is proposed to comprise of a mixture of infiltration (beneath the AGP and MUGA) and a surface water attenuation system which will discharge into an existing surface water connection.

9.128 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have raised objections to the scheme on the basis that, inter alia, the sufficient justification for why a full SuDS system is not being incorporated has not been provided. However, the LLFA have confirmed that subject to the imposition of planning conditions requiring the submission of further information - i.e. justification for the proposed drainage method – they have no objection to permission being granted.

9.129 This additional information has already been submitted by the applicant and forwarded to the LLFA for review, and it is hoped that this will be reviewed prior to determination, at which point the conditions can be removed / varied as appropriate. However, in the event that the information is not reviewed in time, the conditions provide sufficient certainty that the drainage system serving the site will be fit for purpose and will not increase surface water flooding elsewhere.

#### *Archaeology*

9.130 Whilst the application site is not located within an Area of Archaeological Significance, an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment has nonetheless been provided. In summary, it concludes that there are unlikely to be any artefacts of significance affected by the proposed development.

## **10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 Policies CS4 and CS23 are supportive of the construction of new and replacement school facilities on Open Land.

10.2 In line with saved Policy 69 of the Dacorum Local Plan, the environmental character of the location would be retained, there would be no significant detriment to residential amenity, sufficient parking is being provided on site, satisfactory provision has been made for the setting down and picking up of students arriving by private or passenger transport, and ancillary facilities will be available to meet the needs of students.

10.3 Careful consideration has been given to the comments raised by local residents with regard to the potential impact of the development on residential amenity. In summary, whilst there would be limited overshadowing (in the winter months) of some of the rear gardens of the dwellings in Betjeman Way, this would not result in such a severe impact as to weigh in favour of a refusal. In terms of overlooking, the considerable distance between the proposed school building and the nearest dwellings is such that there would be no undue loss of privacy. Turning to the matter of noise and disturbance, the application has been supported by a noise assessment in relation to plant within the site and the use of the AGP for community use. The report has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer who has confirmed that it follows best practice and the relevant standards. Subject to conditions restricting the hours of operation of the AGP and the implementation of acoustic mitigation (as set out in the assessment and supporting documents), it is not considered that there would be any significant detriment to surrounding residents. The MUGA is to be subject to a separate assessment which will be secured by planning condition.

10.4 The new school building would be considerably more compact in form than the somewhat sprawling building that currently occupies the site. It would be of two-storey construction and of similar height to the existing school building. The incorporation of setbacks, architectural detailing and the application of contrasting materials is such that the mass and bulk of the building would be successfully broken up and result in a high quality appearance.

10.5 The Highway Authority have raised no objections to the proposed development, noting that the impacts on the highway network are unlikely to be severe, while the parking provision is considered to be broadly in compliance with the Parking Standards SPD.

## 11. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

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

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

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

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

|      |          |                                       |
|------|----------|---------------------------------------|
| PL02 | Rev. P01 | Location Plan                         |
| PL04 | Rev. P01 | Whole Site Plan                       |
| PL06 | Rev. P01 | Proposed Site Sections                |
| PL13 | Rev. P01 | Proposed Ground Floor Plan            |
| PL14 | Rev. P01 | Proposed First Floor Plan             |
| PL15 | Rev. P01 | Proposed Roof Plan                    |
| PL16 | Rev. P01 | Proposed Elevations - East and West   |
| PL17 | Rev. P01 | Proposed Elevations - North and South |
| PL18 | Rev. P01 | Proposed Building Sections            |

|                                  |                              |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| ZG-DWG-0002311369-0GF-R01-241023 | Ground Floor Lighting Layout |
| ZG-DWG-0002311369-01F-R01-241023 | First Floor Lighting Layout  |

|                            |          |  |
|----------------------------|----------|--|
| SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1003 | Rev. P04 | Site Landscaping Plan 1                                  |
| SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1004 | Rev. P04 | Site Landscaping Plan 2                                  |
| SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1005 | Rev. P05 | Whole Site Plan  |
| SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1010 | Rev. P01 | Sports Provision   |
| SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1011 | Rev. P01 | AWP/MUGA Acoustic Fence Arrangement                      |
| SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1012 | Rev. P01 | Playing Pitch Layout                                     |
| SRP1148-HAL-01-XX-D-E-4011 | Rev. P02 | Specialist Systems Environmental Strategy Drawing - GSHP |
| SRP1148-HAL-01-XX-T-E-0008 | Rev. P02 | Lighting Strategy Report                                 |
| SRP1148-TER-00-XX-T-L-6001 | Rev. P02 | Outline Landscape Specification                          |
| SRP1148-TER-00-XX-T-L-8001 | Rev. 01  | Landscape Management Plan (5 years)                      |

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

3. **No development associated with Phase 2 of the development, as set out on pages 10 & 11 of the Construction Phase Plan (SRP1148-TDC-XX-XX-T-X-0003-ConstructionPhasePlan-P05-S5), shall take place until a soft landscaping plan that includes number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**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 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).

4. **Prior to the commencement of development, in accordance with the submitted Drainage Strategy Statement (reference SRP1148-CAL-XX-XX-T-C-2000, dated 03 November 2023), detailed designs of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme demonstrating how the entire site will be drained incorporating the following measures shall be submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme will be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development. The scheme shall address the following matters:**

1. **Detailed infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (or equivalent) along the length and proposed depth of the proposed infiltration feature/s.**

**OR**

**If infiltration is proven to be unfavourable then greenfield runoff rates for the site shall be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The post development runoff rates will be attenuated to the equivalent Greenfield rate for all rainfall events up to and including the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP). The discharge location for surface water runoff will be confirmed to connect with the wider watercourse or sewer network.**

2. **Provision of surface water attenuation and conveyance in full consideration of the SuDS hierarchy, sized and designed to accommodate the volume of water generated in all rainfall events up to and including the critical storm duration for the 3.33% AEP (1 in 30 year) and 1% AEP (1 in 100) rainfall events (both including allowances for climate change).**

3. **Detailed designs, modelling calculations (using FEH 2013 or 2022, CV values of 1 and with half drain down times within 24 hours) and plans of the of the drainage conveyance network in the:**

**3.33% AEP (1 in 30 year) critical rainfall event plus climate change to show no flooding outside the drainage features on any part of the site.**

**1% AEP (1 in 100 year) critical rainfall plus climate change event to show, if any, the depth, volume and storage location of any flooding outside the drainage features, ensuring that flooding does not occur in any part of a building or any utility plant susceptible to water (e.g. pumping station or electricity substation) within the development. It will also show that no runoff during this event will leave the site uncontrolled.**

**4. Plans to be submitted showing the routes for the management of exceedance surface water flow routes that minimise the risk to people and property during rainfall events in excess of 1% AEP (1 in 100) rainfall event plus climate change allowance. This will include surface water exceedance which may enter the site from elsewhere in excess of the 1 in 100 (1% AEP) rainfall event.**

**5. Finished floor levels of buildings are a minimum of 300mm above expected flood levels of all sources of flooding (including any ordinary watercourses, SuDS features and within any proposed drainage scheme) or 150mm above ground level, whichever is the more precautionary.**

**6. Details of how all surface water management features to be designed in accordance with The SuDS Manual (CIRIA C753, 2015), including appropriate treatment stages for water quality prior to discharge.**

Reason: To prevent flooding and ensure that satisfactory management of local sources of flooding, surface water flow paths, storage and disposal of surface water from the site in a range of rainfall events, in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and paragraphs 173, 175 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). This condition needs to be pre-commencement as the full details need to be understood prior groundworks taking place, otherwise these may limit options for an alternative drainage scheme.

**5. No development shall commence until details and a method statement for interim and temporary drainage measures during the demolition and construction phases have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This information shall provide full details of who will be responsible for maintaining such temporary systems and demonstrate how the site will be drained to ensure there is no increase in the off-site flows, nor any pollution, debris and sediment to any receiving watercourse or sewer system. The site works and construction phase shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with approved method statement, unless alternative measures have been subsequently approved by the Planning Authority.**

Reason: To prevent flooding and pollution offsite in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and paragraphs 173, 175 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). This condition needs to be pre-commencement as the full details need to be understood prior groundworks taking place, otherwise these may limit options for an alternative drainage scheme.

**6. Upon completion of the surface water drainage system, including any SuDS features, and prior to the first use of the development; a survey and verification report from an independent surveyor shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The survey and report shall demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the details approved pursuant to Condition 4. Where necessary, details of corrective works to be carried out along with a timetable for their completion, shall be included for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any corrective works required shall be**

**carried out in accordance with the approved timetable and subsequently re-surveyed with the findings submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To ensure the flood risk is adequately addressed, not increased and users remain safe for the lifetime of the development in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and paragraphs 173, 175 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

- 7. (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 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 an Intrusive Site Investigation 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 to protect human health and the surrounding environment and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32. This condition needs to be pre-commencement as the risks to site operatives and future site users need to be fully understood prior to the mobilisation of any contaminants and in order to ensure that appropriate mitigation takes place, which might not be possible at a later stage.

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



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

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

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

- 9. No piling, deep foundations, or other intrusive groundworks (investigation boreholes/tunnel shafts/ground source heating and cooling systems) using penetrative methods shall be carried out until a "Foundation Works Risk Assessment Report" has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater resources in line with the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection. The site is underlain by a principal aquifer at shallow depth and both piling, and the installation of ground source heat pumps could create preferential pathways for potential contaminants.

INFORMATIVE: The foundation works risk assessment shall be prepared with reference to the guidance presented in Piling into Contaminated Sites (Environment Agency, 2002) available at the following website: [ARCHIVED CONTENT] ([nationalarchives.gov.uk](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk)).

- 10. No development of the Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) or the Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) hereby permitted shall commence until the design specifications of the MUGA and AGP, including details of surfacing, line marking and fencing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The MUGA and AGP shall not be constructed other than in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the development is fit for purpose and sustainable and to accord with Development Plan Policy

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that the design and layout of the MUGA and AGP should comply with Sport England's Artificial Surfaces for Outdoor Sports Design Guidance

- 11. Prior to first use of the Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) hereby approved, the acoustic and weldmesh perimeter fences shown on drawing nos. SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1004 (Site Landscaping Plan 2), SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1005 (Whole Site Plan) and SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1011 (AWP/MUGA Acoustic Fence Arrangement) shall be erected and thereafter permanently retained. The acoustic fence shall be Jackson's Jackoustic or similar equivalent. The weldmesh fence shall be Dulok Sports Rebound or similar equivalent.**

Reason: In order to ensure that the neighbouring properties are not subjected to unacceptable levels of noise disturbance, in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

- 12. Construction of the Multi-Use-Games-Area (MUGA) hereby approved shall not commence until a noise assessment, including a scheme of noise mitigation (if required), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall demonstrate how significant adverse effects from noise to nearby residential occupiers are to be avoided. The assessment shall have regard to, amongst other things, the cumulative impact of noise generated by the Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP).**

**The noise assessment and any required scheme of noise mitigation shall be prepared and compiled by an appropriately experienced and competent persons.**

**The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved noise assessment, including any noise mitigation measures identified as required, and the approved noise mitigation shall be implemented prior to first use of the MUGA and permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: In order to ensure that the neighbouring properties are not subjected to unacceptable levels of noise disturbance, in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

INFORMATIVE: Where noise mitigation is identified as necessary and includes fencing in excess of 2m, a separate grant of planning permission for the fencing would be required.

- 13. Use of the Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) hereby permitted shall not commence until the proposed hours of operation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order to ensure that the neighbouring properties are not subjected to unacceptable levels of noise disturbance, in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

- 14. Use of the Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) hereby permitted shall not take place other than between the hours of:**

- (a) 09:00 - 19:00 on Monday to Friday;**
- (b) 09:00 - 15:00 on Saturday**
- (c) 10:00 - 13:00 on Sunday**

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of the locality in accordance with to Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 135 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).

- 15. No use of the Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) or the Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) hereby permitted shall commence until a community use agreement prepared in consultation with Sport England has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and a copy of the completed approved agreement has been provided to the Local Planning Authority. The agreement shall apply to the school hall, activity studio, MUGA, AGP and supporting ancillary facilities and include details of pricing policy, hours of use, access by non-educational establishment users, management responsibilities and a mechanism for review, and anything else which the Local Planning Authority considers necessary in order to**

**secure the effective community use of the facilities. The development shall not be used at any time other than in strict compliance with the approved agreement.**

Reason: To secure well managed safe community access to the sports facility/facilities, to ensure sufficient benefit to the development of sport and to accord with Development Plan Policy.

- 16. Within one year of the completion of Phase 1 of the development, as set out on page 9 of the Construction Phase Plan (SRP1148-TDC-XX-XX-T-X-0003-ConstructionPhasePlan-P05-S5), the on-site car and cycle parking and turning areas shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plans and retained thereafter for that specific use.**

Reason: To ensure permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring areas and to ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) and Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004).

- 17. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, a School Travel Plan prepared in consultation with Hertfordshire County Council will be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure that sustainable travel options associated with the development are promoted and maximised to be in accordance with Policies 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

INFORMATIVE: The Modeshift STARS travel plan will be updated annually, maintaining a minimum Good Travel Plan (Bronze) accreditation for the lifetime of the school and will include objectives, targets, planned and completed initiatives. The role of Travel Plan Champion shall be created and the responsibility for adhering to the above travel plan requirements shall sit within that role.

- 18. Notwithstanding the details submitted, no development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan. The Construction Management Plan shall include details of:**

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

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with saved Policies 51 and 55 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS8 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 114 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). This condition needs to be pre-commencement as the access to the site (by way of Clover Way) is

constrained and appropriate steps need to be secured and in place prior to construction vehicles entering the site, so as to avoid highway safety issues.

- 19. Within 3 months of completion of the development, fire brigade / emergency services override switches shall be fitted to all electric gates within the site and permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: In order to ensure satisfactory access in the event of a fire / emergency in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013).

- 20. Within one year of the completion of Phase 1 of the development, as set out on page 9 of the Construction Phase Plan (SRP1148-TDC-XX-XX-T-X-0003-ConstructionPhasePlan-P05-S5, Electric Vehicle Charging Points and associated infrastructure shall be provided in accordance with drawing SRP148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1004 and permanently retained thereafter.**

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).

- 21. No development associated with Phase 2 of the development, as set out on pages 10 & 11 of the Construction Phase Plan (SRP1148-TDC-XX-XX-T-X-0003-ConstructionPhasePlan-P05-S5), shall take place until full details of passive Electric Vehicle Charging provision have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The passive provision shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained thereafter.**

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).

- 22. No development shall take place until full details of the tree protection measures for all trees and hedges to be retained has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These measures shall be set out in a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement, which includes the specification, location and type of protective fencing, the timings for the erection and removal of the protective fencing, the details of any hard surfacing and underground services proposed within the root protection areas, all to be in accordance with the British Standard for Trees in Relation to Construction 5837: 2012, and the monitoring of tree protection measures during construction. All tree protective measures shall be carried out as set out in strict accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement throughout construction.**

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 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). This condition needs to be pre-commencement as insufficient information has been provided to satisfy the Local Planning Authority that damage to trees would not occur, and trees being living organisms, this damage could be irreparable.

- 23. No exterior lighting shall be installed until a sensitive lighting scheme is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme should follow**

**guidance from the Bat Conservation Trust and Institution of Lighting Professionals (2023), and be designed to minimise light spill, in particular directing light away from boundary vegetation to ensure that dark corridors remain for use by wildlife as well as directing lighting away from potential roost / nesting sites.**

**The submitted details shall include, but not be limited to, a lighting statement that includes all information set out in paragraph A8.18 of Appendix 8 of the Dacorum Local Plan.**

**The lighting shall thereafter be installed, operated and maintained in accordance with the approved particulars.**

Reason: To avoid adverse impacts on wildlife, the amenity of nearby residential uses and in the interests of visual amenity, in accordance with Policies CS12, CS26, CS29 and CS32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013), Policy 113 and Appendix 8 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004).

#### **Informatives:**

1. Environment Agency

We endorse the use of water efficiency measures especially in new developments. Use of technology that ensures efficient use of natural resources could support the environmental benefits of future proposals and could help attract investment to the area. Therefore, water efficient technology, fixtures and fittings should be considered as part of new developments. Commercial/Industrial developments.

We recommend that all new non-residential development of 1000sqm gross floor area or more should meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption. We also recommend you contact your local planning authority for more information.

2. Affinity Water

Being within a water stressed area, we expect that the development includes water efficient fixtures and fittings. Measures such as rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling help the environment by reducing pressure for abstractions in chalk stream catchments. They also minimise potable water use by reducing the amount of potable water used for washing, cleaning and watering gardens. This in turn reduces the carbon emissions associated with treating this water to a standard suitable for drinking, and will help in our efforts to get emissions down in the borough.

There are potentially water mains running through or near to part of proposed development site. If the development goes ahead as proposed, the developer will need to get in contact with our Developer Services Team to discuss asset protection or diversionary measures. This can be done through the My Developments Portal (<https://affinitywater.custhelp.com/>) or [aw\\_developerservices@custhelp.com](mailto:aw_developerservices@custhelp.com).

In this location Affinity Water will supply drinking water to the development. To apply for a new or upgraded connection, please contact our Developer Services Team by going through their My Developments Portal (<https://affinitywater.custhelp.com/>) or [aw\\_developerservices@custhelp.com](mailto:aw_developerservices@custhelp.com). The Team also handle C3 and C4 requests to cost potential water mains diversions. If a water mains plan is required, this can also be obtained by emailing [maps@affinitywater.co.uk](mailto:maps@affinitywater.co.uk). Please note that charges may apply.

3. Hertfordshire Ecology

In order to protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young, development should only be carried out during the period October to February inclusive. If this is not possible then a pre-development (i.e. no greater than 48 hours before clearance begins) search of the area should be made by a suitably experienced ecologist. If active nests are found, then works must be delayed until the birds have left the nest or professional ecological advice taken on how best to proceed.

The site has potential for badgers, and hedgehogs; therefore, the mitigation included in s4.4.4 for hedgehogs, and s4.4.5 for badgers should be followed in full.

4. Thames Water

The applicant is advised that their development boundary falls within a Source Protection Zone for groundwater abstraction. These zones may be at particular risk from polluting activities on or below the land surface. To prevent pollution, the Environment Agency and Thames Water (or other local water undertaker) will use a tiered, risk-based approach to regulate activities that may impact groundwater resources. The applicant is encouraged to read the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection (available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements>) and may wish to discuss the implication for their development with a suitably qualified environmental consultant.

5. Environmental Health

Contractors and sub-contractors must have regard to BS 5228-2:2009 "Code of Practice for Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites" and the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

Where permission is sought for works to be carried out outside the hours stated, applications in writing must be made with at least seven days' notice to Environmental and Community Protection. Local residents that may be affected by the work shall also be notified in writing, after approval is received from the LPA or Environmental Health.

Works audible at the site boundary outside these hours may result in the service of a Notice restricting the hours as above. Breach of the notice may result in prosecution and an unlimited fine and/or six months imprisonment.

Under no circumstances should waste produced from the development be incinerated on site. This includes but is not limited to pallet stretch wrap, used bulk bags, building materials, product of demolition and so on. Suitable waste management should be in place to reduce, reuse, recover or recycle waste product on site, or dispose of appropriately.

Invasive and Injurious Weeds - Informative

Weeds such as Japanese Knotweed, Giant Hogweed and Ragwort are having a detrimental impact on our environment and may injure livestock. Land owners must not plant or otherwise cause to grow in the wild any plant listed on schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Developers and land owners should therefore undertake an invasive weeds survey before development commences and take the steps necessary to avoid weed spread. Further advice can be obtained from the Environment Agency website at <https://www.gov.uk/japanese-knotweed-giant-hogweed-and-other-invasive-plants>.

As a guideline, the following hours for noisy works should be observed.

- Monday to Friday, 7.30am to 5.30pm
- Saturday, 8am to 1pm
- Sunday and bank holidays – no noisy work allowed.

All noisy operation outside these hours, for example emergency works, will require consent. Please email Environmental and Community Protection ([ecp@dacorum.gov.uk](mailto:ecp@dacorum.gov.uk)) as soon as possible.

## APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

| Consultee                                | Comments  |
|--|---|
| Affinity Water - Three Valleys Water PLC | <p>You should be aware that the proposed development site is located within an Environment Agency defined groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) corresponding to our Pumping Station (MARL). This is a public water supply, comprising a number of Chalk abstraction boreholes, operated by Affinity Water Ltd.</p> <p>Provided that the below conditions are implemented and it has been demonstrated that public water supply will not be impacted, we would have no objections to the development.</p> <p>Contamination through Ground Works:</p> <p>If any works involving excavations are necessary, then the following condition needs to be implemented:</p> <p>Condition 1</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of the development, no works involving excavations (e.g. piling or the implementation of a geothermal open/closed loop system) shall be carried until the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Affinity Water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Intrusive Ground Investigation to identify the current state of the site and appropriate techniques to avoid displacing any shallow contamination to a greater depth.</li> <li>• A Remediation Strategy/Report if found to be needed following the results of the intrusive investigation detailing how contamination (if found) will be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved with a robust pre and post monitoring plan to determine its effectiveness.</li> <li>• A Risk Assessment identifying both the aquifer and the abstraction point(s) as potential receptor(s) of contamination including turbidity generation from groundworks.</li> <li>• A Foundations Works Method Statement and Risk Assessment detailing the depth and type of excavations (e.g. piling) to be</li> </ul> |

undertaken including mitigation measures (e.g. turbidity monitoring, appropriate piling design, off site monitoring boreholes etc.) to prevent or minimise any potential migration of pollutants including turbidity or existing contaminants such as hydrocarbons to public water supply. Any excavations must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved method statement.

- Acknowledgement of the need to notify Affinity Water of excavation works 15 days before commencement in order to implement enhanced monitoring at the public water supply abstraction and to plan for potential interruption of service with regards to water supply

Reason: Excavation works such as piling have the potential to cause water quality failures due to elevated concentrations of contaminants through displacement to a greater depths and turbidity generation. Increased concentrations of contaminants, particularly turbidity, impacts the ability to treat water for public water supply.

Contamination during construction:

Construction works may exacerbate any known or previously unidentified contamination. If any pollution is found at the site, then works should cease immediately and appropriate monitoring and remediation will need to be undertaken to avoid any impact on water quality in the chalk aquifer.

Condition 2

If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, then no further development shall be carried out until the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Affinity Water:

- A Remediation Strategy/Report detailing how contamination will be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved with a robust pre and post monitoring plan to determine its effectiveness.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to unacceptable concentrations of pollution posing a risk to public water supply from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site and to prevent deterioration of groundwater and/or surface water.

Contamination through Surface Water Drainage:

Surface water drainage should use appropriate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems that prevent the mobilisation of any contaminants



where a direct pathway to the aquifer is present. This should use appropriate techniques that prevent direct pathways into the aquifer and that ensure sufficient capacity is provided for all surface water to be dealt with on site, preventing consequential flooding elsewhere.

### Condition 3

Prior to the commencement of development, no works shall be carried out until the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Affinity Water:

- A Surface Water Drainage Scheme demonstrating appropriate use of sustainable urban drainage systems that prevent the mobilisation of any contaminants ensuring protection of surface and groundwater.

Reason: Surface water drainage can mobilise contaminants into the aquifer through infiltration in areas impacted by ground contamination. Surface water also has the potential to become contaminated and can enter the aquifer through open pathways, either created for drainage or moved towards existing open pathways where existing drainage has reached capacity. All have the potential to impact public water supply.

Issues arising from any of the above can cause critical abstractions to switch off resulting in the immediate need for water to be sourced from another location, which incurs significant costs and risks of loss of supply during periods of high demand.

The construction works and operation of the proposed development site should be done in accordance with the relevant British Standards and Best Management Practices, thereby significantly reducing the groundwater pollution risk.

For further information we refer you to CIRIA Publication C532 "Control of water pollution from construction - guidance for consultants and contractors".

### Water efficiency

Being within a water stressed area, we expect that the development includes water efficient fixtures and fittings. Measures such as rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling help the environment by reducing pressure for abstractions in chalk stream catchments. They also minimise potable water use by reducing the amount of potable water used for washing, cleaning and watering gardens. This in turn reduces the carbon emissions associated with treating this water to a standard suitable for drinking, and will help in our efforts to get emissions down in the borough.

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
|                                     | <p>Infrastructure connections and diversions</p> <p>There are potentially water mains running through or near to part of proposed development site. If the development goes ahead as proposed, the developer will need to get in contact with our Developer Services Team to discuss asset protection or diversionary measures. This can be done through the My Developments Portal (<a href="https://affinitywater.custhelp.com/">https://affinitywater.custhelp.com/</a>) or <a href="mailto:aw_developerservices@custhelp.com">aw_developerservices@custhelp.com</a>.</p> <p>In this location Affinity Water will supply drinking water to the development. To apply for a new or upgraded connection, please contact our Developer Services Team by going through their My Developments Portal (<a href="https://affinitywater.custhelp.com/">https://affinitywater.custhelp.com/</a>) or <a href="mailto:aw_developerservices@custhelp.com">aw_developerservices@custhelp.com</a>. The Team also handle C3 and C4 requests to cost potential water mains diversions. If a water mains plan is required, this can also be obtained by emailing <a href="mailto:maps@affinitywater.co.uk">maps@affinitywater.co.uk</a>. Please note that charges may apply.</p>   |
| <p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p> | <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Notice is given under article 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>1. Provision of Access and Parking</p> <p>Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the proposed access, on-site car and cycle parking and turning areas shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plans and retained thereafter available for that specific use.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring areas and to ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>2. School Travel Plan</p> <p>Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, the School Travel Plan shall be updated and submitted to the County Council for approval. The Modeshift STARS travel plan will be updated annually, maintaining a minimum Good Travel Plan (Bronze) accreditation for the lifetime of the school and will include objectives, targets, planned and</p> |

completed initiatives. The role of Travel Plan Champion shall be created and the responsibility for adhering to the above travel plan requirements shall sit within that role.

Reason: To ensure that sustainable travel options associated with the development are promoted and maximised to be in accordance with Policies 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

### 3. Construction Management Plan

No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan. The Construction Management Plan shall include details of:

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

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

#### Comments / Analysis

The application comprises of the demolition of the existing school and construction of a new school building, layout and associated works at St Cuthbert Mayne Catholic Junior School, Clover Way, Hemel Hempstead.

A Transport Statement (TS) has been submitted as part of the application.

#### Access

The existing access into the school site is via Clover Way, which is a cul-de-sac designated as an unclassified local access road, subject to a speed limit of 30mph and is highway maintainable at public expense. The school is located within a largely residential area.

The proposals do not include any changes to the access into the site from the highway. The proposals include rearrangements to the internal vehicle and pedestrian accesses within the site, the layout of which is shown on drawing number SRP1148-TER-00-XX-D-L-1005. The proposals include a 5m wide access road leading to a parking and turning area.

Swept path analysis plans for a 8.4m long fire tender (drawing no. T-02 P1) and a 11.4m long refuse vehicle ((drawing no. T-01 P1) have been submitted as part of the TS. The general details are considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority and illustrates that the largest anticipated vehicle (refuse vehicle) to access the site would be able to turn around on site and egress to the highway in forward gear.

Whilst HCC as Highway Authority does not have any specific concerns in respect to emergency vehicle access, following consideration of the size of the development within a larger school site, details of the proposals have been passed to Herts Fire & Rescue for attention and for any comments, recommendations or objections which they may have.

#### Vehicle and Cycle Parking

The application includes a total provision of 25 car parking spaces, a slight increase on the current level of 22, which is the same level as existing. HCC as Highway Authority would not have a specific objection to the overall level of parking provision when taking into consideration that the number of staff and pupils is not proposed to be increased. Five of the parking spaces are proposed to have electric vehicle charging provision, which is supported by to encourage electric vehicle use in accordance with the Highway Authority's Local Transport Plan (LTP4) and Sustainability Strategy.

DBC as the planning and parking authority would ultimately need to be satisfied with the overall level and type of proposed parking.

The layout and design of the car parking areas are considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Manual for Streets (MfS). Swept path analysis / tracking plan has been included for an estate car to illustrate use of the car parking spaces, which is considered to be acceptable.

The proposals included two shelters to accommodate 16 cycle parking spaces and 16 scooter spaces. HCC as Highway Authority would recommend the ongoing monitoring of cycle usage and the subsequent increase in on-site cycle parking to reflect this as and when required. This would be necessary to support the promotion and maximisation of cycling as a form of travel to and from the site for students, staff and visitors and to ensure that the proposals are in accordance with LTP4.

#### Trip Generation and Highway Impact

The proposals do not include an increase in the capacity of the school for students nor any changes to the number of staff. A trip attraction assessment for the school has been included as part of the TS (Sections 5).

Following consideration of the assessment and size of the proposals and the fact that the number of students or staff is not proposed to be increased as a result of the proposals, any impacts from the proposals from a trip generation perspective on the surrounding highway network would not be considered to be significant or severe.

#### School Travel Plan

A School Travel Plan (TP) has been submitted as part of the application. It would be recommended that the travel plan is submitted to the travel plan team via the link below and to ensure compliance with the recommended school travel plan above.

For further information please see the following link:

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx> OR by emailing [travelplans@hertfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:travelplans@hertfordshire.gov.uk) .

#### Drainage Assessment

A Drainage Strategy has been submitted as part of the application. HCC as Highway Authority would recommend that HCC as Lead Local Flood Authority is formally consulted in respect to the drainage strategy at: [FRMconsultations@hertfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:FRMconsultations@hertfordshire.gov.uk)

#### Conclusion

HCC as Highway Authority has considered that the proposals would not have a significant impact on the safety and operation of the nearest highway and therefore would not wish object to the granting of planning permission, subject to the inclusion of the above planning conditions.

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Hertfordshire Ecology | <p>Overall Recommendation:</p> <p>Application can be determined with no ecological objections (with any informatives / conditions listed below).</p> <p>Summary of Advice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• T12 and T18 should undergo a soft fell.</li><li>• Sensitive lighting scheme condition.</li><li>• CEMP condition.</li><li>• No measurable net gain proposed.</li></ul> <p>Supporting documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Ecological Survey</li><li>2. Bat Report</li></ol> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <p>Overview: The proposed development site is situated in a residential area, with Gadebridge Park adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The site is not particularly of ecological importance, with the habitats predominantly comprising hardstanding, buildings and modified grassland. There is a small patch of broadleaved woodland northwest within the site boundary, which will have importance for a range of species, and this area is proposed to be retained. There are some scattered trees, a line of trees, and a hedgerow present.</p> <p>Chilterns Beechwoods SAC: The site lies within the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Zone of Influence, however as no residential net gain is proposed, a HRA is not required.</p> <p>Bats: All buildings on site were deemed to be of negligible suitability for bats, therefore the demolition of the current building has no associated ecological constraints. There are 5 trees suitable for bats on site, however only 2 of them are proposed to be felled (T12 and T18) to allow for the new MUGA pitch to be created. These trees were assessed in the supporting bat survey document, however the plans in the Design and Access Statement (Part 1 and 3) relating to tree removal do not correspond with the trees proposed for removal in the bat report. Notwithstanding the inconsistencies between various reports, the following advice will assume that as stated in the bat report, T12 and T18 are proposed to be removed, both of which have already been subject to emergence and re-entry surveys.</p> <p>T12 was classified to have high suitability for bats, and T18, moderate suitability. This prompted the need for further surveys for both trees,</p> |
|-----------------------|--|

which have been carried out by Thompson Environmental Consultants. There were survey limitations relating to the time in which the surveys could be carried out, therefore, the recommended time between each survey stated as best practice by the Bat Conservation Trust (2023) has not been followed.

3 dusk/dawn surveys were carried out on T12 on 16/08/2023 (dusk), 22/08/2023 (dawn), and 05/09/2023 (dawn). Similarly, 3 surveys were undertaken for T18 with the surveys being conducted on 17/08/2023 (dawn), 21/08/2023 (dusk), 04/09/2023 (dusk). Although the correct number of surveys have been completed, there are constraints represented with these surveys since they contradict the current best practice guidelines (2023) where only dusk emergence surveys are considered adequate in determining the likely absence of bats. Albeit, since the new guidelines were released soon after these surveys were completed, I do not consider it reasonable to request more. However, 2 of the surveys conducted on T12 (high suitability) were carried out as dawn re-entry surveys, therefore only one of the surveys (dated 16/08/2023) is thus considered adequate. Consequently, due to the limitations, I advise that if both T12 and T18 are still to be removed, a soft-felling approach should also be adopted.

There will be multiple retained trees on site that have features suitable for roosting bats, and this increases the likelihood that bats will be present. As a new building replacement is proposed, and this is in close proximity some of the scattered trees, any external lighting should consider any foraging, commuting, and roosting bats that may be using the site. Consequently, I advise that a sensitive lighting scheme is submitted to the LPA as a condition of approval. Condition wording is stated below.

"No development shall take place until a sensitive lighting scheme is submitted for approval. This scheme should follow guidance from the Bat Conservation Trust and Institution of Lighting Professionals (2023), and be designed to minimise light spill, in particular directing light away from boundary vegetation to ensure that dark corridors remain for use by wildlife as well as directing lighting away from potential roost / nesting sites".

PEA: A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was undertaken by Urban Green in September 2022 to check whether protected species are utilizing the site. The woodland has some potential for nesting birds, badgers, and hedgehogs; therefore, this is regarded as the highest value habitat. The woodland is proposed to be retained, therefore the recommendation in s4.3.1 relating to fencing to protect the woodland from the potential impacts of the construction period should be followed, and this should form part of a Construction and Environmental

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
|                             | <p>Management Plan (CEMP) and should be secured by condition.</p> <p>Badger and hedgehogs: The PEA concluded that the site has potential for badgers, and hedgehogs. The mitigation included in s4.4.4 for hedgehogs, and s4.4.5 for badgers should also be included in the already conditioned CEMP.</p> <p>Nesting birds: The scattered trees, hedgerow, and line of trees can be useful habitat for nesting birds. All wild birds, their nests, eggs and young are afforded protection and in general terms it would be an offence to kill, injure or displace breeding birds and their young. To reduce the risk of an offence being committed, I advise that the nesting bird mitigation below should be outlined in the already conditioned CEMP, and this should address how breeding birds will be protected throughout the construction phase.</p> <p>"In order to protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young, development should only be carried out during the period October to February inclusive. If this is not possible then a pre-development (i.e. no greater than 48 hours before clearance begins) search of the area should be made by a suitably experienced ecologist. If active nests are found, then works must be delayed until the birds have left the nest or professional ecological advice taken on how best to proceed".</p> <p>BNG: A Landscape Management Plan has been submitted, proposing various ecological features such as species-rich grassland/wildflower meadow, bird and bat boxes, and tree planting. Whilst I am pleased to see that a plan has been proposed, applications of this nature are not yet subject to a legal requirement to deliver at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). If DBC wish to seek measurable BNG from this development, a complete BNG metric consistent with Natural England guidance should be submitted, along with a Biodiversity Gain Plan, as a condition of approval. Should DBC wish to have this demonstrated prior to determination, the proposals should not be approved until this is provided. This reflects the expectation of the Environment Act 2021. Use of the most up to date Biodiversity Metric is also a requirement.</p> |
| Water Officer (HCC)         | <p>It's noted in the Building Services Specification that the existing hydrant on the site boundary will be retained and utilised. Providing this is carried out we won't require further hydrants.</p>  |
| Conservation & Design (DBC) | <p>Design and layout:</p> <p>Whilst the development proposes a significant relocation of the school building, it is considered that the rearrangement of the landscaped car park and forecourt are an overall improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relocated building footprint results in an improved relationship</li> </ul>  |



with the adjacent school buildings. The proposed location brings the neighbouring buildings in line with one and other, creating an element of coherence across the education facilities.

- In pushing the main school block away from the car park, not only does the design improve the outlook from the classrooms, but the area surrounding the car park appears more open, and set within a more landscaped area.
- The distribution, scale and location of the proposed car parking is considered to be acceptable. We welcome the integrated landscaped elements that soften the overall appearance of the hard surfaced area. In addition, there appears to be suitable areas directly in front of the main school building that allow for safe and off road waiting.
- From a design perspective, we do not see any issues with the location of the artificial grass pitch or proposed MUGA.
- Further clarification is required to understand the proposed screening of the substation and Bin store.
- From a design perspective, there are concerns regarding the proposed location of the prayer garden. It is considered that the distance between the proposed substation and bin store area and the prayer garden is not an appropriate offset. Further screening and planting would be required if there is not the option of relocating one of these components to a more suitable setting.

#### Materials and appearance:

Overall the appearance and proposed materials are considered to be of a high-quality, responding to the context and drawing from the original school buildings. The resultant building sits comfortably within the context, and whilst it could appear large, the application of materials has broken up the overall appearance well ensuring it is not overbearing or bulky. The materials and distribution of windows, doors and openings creates a building that feels light, and builds an attractive and inspiring environment for the future students.

- The use of buff multi-stock results in a high-quality appearance that responds to the context well and is a welcomed approach to the materiality.
- Whilst we usually prefer to avoid the use of render, bearing in mind the size and scale of development it is considered that with

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>an appropriate maintenance plan the rendered façade can achieve and maintain a high-quality appearance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of lighter and darker blue rendered panels also adds elements of visual intrigue and are again a welcomed detail.</li> <li>• Further details regarding the boundary treatments and internal fencing are required.</li> </ul> <p>Scale and massing:</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed redevelopment of the school has achieved a condensed built form and reduced the overall appearance of the school. From a design perspective it is felt that the heights are appropriate across the scheme, ensuring sympathetic stepped approach, suitable offset from neighbouring properties and appropriate setbacks and architectural detailing. The resultant building is one that has responded to the context, is well-proportioned and attractive in its locality.</p>   |
| Strategic Planning & Regeneration (DBC) | We do not wish to comment on this application.  |
| Environment Agency                      | <p>Thank you for consulting us on the above application on 13 December 2023. As part of the consultation, we have reviewed the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase II Geo-Environmental Assessment Report prepared by HSP Consulting Engineers Ltd, dated 30 March 2023 (ref.: HSP2023-C4128-G-GPII-1325, project number: C4128).</li> <li>• Drainage Strategy Statement prepared by Calcinotto, dated 3 November 2023 (ref.: SRP1148-CAL-XX-XX-T-C-2000).</li> <li>• Building Services Specification by Halsion, dated 31 October 2023 (ref.: SRP1148-HAL-01-XX-T-M-0010, revision P03).</li> </ul> <p>Environment Agency Position</p> <p>Groundwater is particularly sensitive in this location because the proposed development site is within source protection zone 1, associated with an Affinity Water pumping station ~600m south. Furthermore, the Made Ground at the proposed development site contains elevated levels of contaminants of concern that could be mobilised and impact on controlled waters, specifically groundwater in the underlying Chalk bedrock Principal Aquifer, as a result of the proposed redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>We note that piled foundations were not originally deemed necessary for the proposed buildings - in favour of traditional shallow foundation designs - within the Phase II GeoEnvironmental Assessment Report. However, the report also states that an additional</p> |

rotary borehole would be needed if piled foundations are favoured in the final design stage, and we can see on the map of soakage testing locations in Section 4.6.1 (Figure 3) of the Drainage Strategy Statement (ref.: SRP1148-CAL-XX-XX-T-C-2000) that HSP appear to have drilled this extra borehole.

The information surrounding this and the ramifications on the favoured foundation design for the proposed development have not been made available to us, so we cannot rule out that piled foundations will be used for this development. Piling can create preferential pathways to aid the migration of contaminants of concern towards sensitive groundwater receptors. The installation of ground source heat pumps can also have this effect, which we note are proposed in the submitted Building

#### Services

Specification (ref.: SRP1148-HAL-01-XX-T-M-0010, revision P03). Considering the information provided, we have no objection to the proposed development given the inclusion of the following conditions on any grant of decision notice. Without these conditions we would object to the proposal in line with paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework because it cannot be guaranteed that the development will not be put at unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution.

#### Condition 1 - Remediation Strategy

##### Advice for Condition 1

The Phase II Geo-Environmental Assessment Report by HSP will suffice (1), (2), and part-suffice (3). We note some uncertainty in Section 6 of the Report whether remedial works are to be undertaken; if so, this report should form the basis of a plan that fully satisfies (3), and be accompanied by a means of confirming its effectiveness to satisfy (4).

#### Condition 2 - Unexpected Contamination

If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason

To ensure that the development does not contribute to and is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. This is in line with paragraphs 180, 189, and 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 3 - Piling & Ground Source Heat Pumps

Piling, deep foundations, or other intrusive groundworks (investigation boreholes/tunnel shafts/ground source heating and cooling systems) using penetrative methods shall not be carried out other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater resources in line with the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection. The site is underlain by a principal aquifer at shallow depth and both piling, and the installation of ground source heat pumps could create preferential pathways for potential contaminants. A foundation works risk assessment will be required, prepared with reference to the guidance presented in Piling into Contaminated Sites (Environment Agency, 2002) available at the following website: [ARCHIVED CONTENT] ([nationalarchives.gov.uk](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk)).

Advice for Condition 3

We have not been made aware of any final foundation design. The use of piled foundations and other types of intrusive groundworks such as the installation of ground source heat pumps have the potential to create new pollutant linkages, potentially resulting in the deterioration of groundwater quality beneath the site. We recommend exploring the use of shallower foundations as much as possible to eliminate the need to produce a foundation works risk assessment, which involves long-term groundwater monitoring which may prove difficult to carry out during school operation.

Condition 4 - Infiltration Drainage

No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water to the ground are permitted other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. Any proposals for such systems must be supported by an assessment of the risks to controlled waters.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved

details.

Reason To ensure that the development does not contribute to and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution caused by mobilised contaminants. This is in line with paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Advice for Condition 4

The drainage strategy presented in the Drainage Strategy Statement by Calcinotto (ref.: SRP1148-CAL-XX-XX-T-C-2000) is acceptable, and we note that infiltration drainage is only currently the plan for surface water management in the MUGA area in the west where infiltration drainage is deemed viable.

Advice to Local Planning Authority

Piling/foundation advice

Please note that the risk to controlled groundwater receptors at this site is very much dependent on the type of foundations needed. Given the information provided, we note uncertainty regarding this, but it would appear an additional borehole was drilled to inform geotechnical design upon consultant recommendation. If piling is not proposed, Condition 3 can be partially discharged, but not fully since this condition also covers the installation of ground source heat pumps.

The current drainage strategy is acceptable. Should the drainage strategy change during the final design/planning process, particularly to include infiltration drainage in areas such as the car park, we request to be reconsulted so we can ensure there are appropriate pollution measures in place to prevent contaminants from infrequent spillages, for example, entering the ground.

The control of emissions from Non-Road Going Mobile Machinery (NRMM) at major residential, commercial or industrial sites.

Where development involves the use of any non-road going mobile machinery with a net rated power of 37kW and up to 560kW, that is used during site preparation, construction, demolition, and/ or operation, at that site, we strongly recommend that the machinery used shall meet or exceed the latest emissions standards set out in Regulation (EU) 2016/1628 (as amended). This shall apply to the point that the machinery arrives on site, regardless of it being hired or purchased, unless agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. This is particularly important for major residential, commercial, or

industrial development located in or within 2km of an Air Quality Management Area for oxides of Nitrogen (NOx), and or particulate matter that has an aerodynamic diameter of 10 or 2.5 microns (PM10 and PM2.5). Use of low emission technology will improve or maintain air quality and support LPAs and developers in improving and maintaining local air quality standards and support their net zero objectives.

We also advise, the item(s) of machinery must also be registered (where a register is available) for inspection by the appropriate Competent Authority (CA), which is usually the local authority.

The requirement to include this may already be required by a policy in the local plan or strategic spatial strategy document. The Environment Agency can also require this same standard to be applied to sites which it regulates. To avoid dual regulation this informative should only be applied to the site preparation, construction, and demolition phases at sites that may require an environmental permit. Non-Road Mobile Machinery includes items of plant such as bucket loaders, forklift trucks, excavators, 360 grab, mobile cranes, machine lifts, generators, static pumps, piling rigs etc. The Applicant should be able to state or confirm the use of such machinery in their application to which this then can be applied.

#### Competent persons

The proposed development will be acceptable if a planning condition is included requiring the submission of a remediation strategy, carried out by a competent person in line with paragraph 183 of the NPPF. The Planning Practice Guidance defines a

"Competent Person (to prepare site investigation information): A person with a recognised relevant qualification, sufficient experience in dealing with the type(s) of pollution or land instability, and membership of a relevant professional organisation."(<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/policy/achieving-sustainable-development/annex-2-glossary/>)"

#### Advice to applicant

#### Water Resources

Increased water efficiency for all new developments potentially enables more growth with the same water resources. Developers can highlight positive corporate social responsibility messages and the use of technology to help sell their homes. For the homeowner lower water usage also reduces water and energy bills.

We endorse the use of water efficiency measures especially in new developments. Use of technology that ensures efficient use of natural

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>resources could support the environmental benefits of future proposals and could help attract investment to the area. Therefore, water efficient technology, fixtures and fittings should be considered as part of new developments.</p> <p>Commercial/Industrial developments</p> <p>We recommend that all new non-residential development of 1000sqm gross floor area or more should meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption. We also recommend you contact your local planning authority for more information.</p> <p>Pre-Application Advice</p> <p>Regarding future applications, if you would like us to review a revised technical report prior to a formal submission, outside of a statutory consultation, and/or meet to discuss our position, this will be chargeable in line with our planning advice service. If you wish to request a document review or meeting, please contact our team email address at <a href="mailto:HNLsustainableplaces@environment-agency.gov.uk">HNLsustainableplaces@environment-agency.gov.uk</a>.</p> <p>Final comments</p> <p>Thank you for contacting us regarding the above application. Our comments are based on our available records and the information submitted to us. Please quote our reference number in any future correspondence. Please provide us with a copy of the decision notice for our records. This would be greatly appreciated.</p> |
| <p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p> | <p>Having reviewed the planning application submissions, in particular the HSP Phase II Geo-Environmental Assessment Report - March 2023 and the EPS Phase I report dated November 2022, and the records held by the Environmental and Community Protection (ECP) Team I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed development. However, 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 that it will be remediated.</p> <p>Specifically, the following land contamination planning conditions will be required.</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</p>  |

Local Planning Authority of a written Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment 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 an Intrusive Site Investigation 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 to protect human health and the surrounding environment 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.

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

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

Informative:

The above conditions are in line with paragraphs 174 (e) & (f) and 183 and 184 of the NPPF 2023.

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>

and

here:

[https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/environment-health/development-on-potentially-contaminated-land.pdf?sfvrsn=c00f109f\\_8](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/environment-health/development-on-potentially-contaminated-land.pdf?sfvrsn=c00f109f_8)

The above recommendations reflect the following:

- 1) The Phase I report doesn't identify the use of any of the buildings that are to be demolished. For example, whether there is boiler room or plant room.
- 2) Deficiencies with the submitted HSP Phase II report, including:
  - a. Absence of an initial Conceptual Site Model (CSM)
  - b. Absence of an updated CSM
  - c. No justification for sampling locations
  - d. Inadequate ground gas risk assessment and no definitive recommendation regarding need for ground gas protection
  - e. None of the laboratory analysis are MCERTS accredited, and some of the analysis is not UKAS accredited.
  - f. No discussion of uncertainties

Further to the above this department would suggest the following conditions and informatives regarding the application.

- 1) Works audible at the site boundary will not exceed the following times unless with the written permission of the Local Planning Authority / Environmental and Community Protection. Monday to Friday 07.30 to 17.30 hrs, Saturday 08.00 to 13.00 and at no time whatsoever on Sundays or Public/Bank Holidays. This includes deliveries to the site and any work undertaken by contractors and sub-contractors.

REASON: In the interests of safeguarding residential amenity in accordance with Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and the relevant sections of the NPPF (2019)

Informative: Contractors and sub-contractors must have regard to BS 5228-2:2009 "Code of Practice for Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites" and the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

Where permission is sought for works to be carried out outside the hours stated, applications in writing must be made with at least seven days' notice to Environmental and Community Protection. Local residents that may be affected by the work shall also be notified in writing, after approval is received from the LPA or Environmental Health.

Works audible at the site boundary outside these hours may result in the service of a Notice restricting the hours as above. Breach of the notice may result in prosecution and an unlimited fine and/or six months imprisonment.

#### Waste Management Informative

Under no circumstances should waste produced from the development be incinerated on site. This includes but is not limited to pallet stretch wrap, used bulk bags, building materials, product of demolition and so on. Suitable waste management should be in place to reduce, reuse, recover or recycle waste product on site, or dispose of appropriately.

#### Invasive and Injurious Weeds - Informative

Weeds such as Japanese Knotweed, Giant Hogweed and Ragwort are having a detrimental impact on our environment and may injure livestock. Land owners must not plant or otherwise cause to grow in the wild any plant listed on schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Developers and land owners should therefore undertake an

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>invasive weeds survey before development commences and take the steps necessary to avoid weed spread. Further advice can be obtained from the Environment Agency website at <a href="https://www.gov.uk/japanese-knotweed-giant-hogweed-and-other-invasive-plants">https://www.gov.uk/japanese-knotweed-giant-hogweed-and-other-invasive-plants</a></p>   |
| <p>Hertfordshire Fire &amp; Rescue (HCC)</p> | <p>Following information sent to us from Highways Agency, with regards to the above planning application, we have examined the drawings and note that the provision for access does not appear to be adequate to comply with the building regulations 2010. As discussed and further to the Comments / Analysis on access that were made by Adam Whinnett on 8th December 2023, please see our comments below.</p> <p><b>ACCESS AND FACILITIES</b></p> <p>Access for fire fighting vehicles should be in accordance with The Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document B (ADB) Vol 2, section B5, sub-section 15 including Table 15.2.</p> <p>Appliance access minimum width of the road between kerbs is to be 3.7m.</p> <p>Minimum width of gateways is 3.1 m</p> <p>It appears that gates are located at the front entrance to the access to the school ground and at the side of the premises, where the turning facilities are provided which will be required to have a Fire Brigade access override system in place to allow access in the event of an emergency.</p> <p>Where access to an elevation is provided in accordance with Table 15.1, the following requirements should be met, depending on the building height.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Buildings up to 11m, excluding small buildings (paragraph 15.1): pump appliance access should be provided adjacent to the building for the specified percentage of the total perimeter.</li> <li>b. Buildings over 11m: access routes should comply with the guidance in Diagram 15.2. Access to 15% of the perimeter of the premises appears to be being met.</li> </ol> <p>Building Bulletin 100: Design for fire safety in schools acknowledges the important role of sprinklers. Sprinkler systems installed in buildings can significantly reduce the degree of damage caused by fire and can reduce the risk to life. On 1 March 2007, DCSF announced the new policy on sprinklers and their value as a measure against the risk of fire and arson. All new schools should have fire sprinklers installed except</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>in a few low risk schools.</p> <p><b>WATER SUPPLIES</b></p> <p>For guidance and requirements water for supplies for fire-fighting (Fire hydrants) at this location, please contact Hertfordshire Fire &amp; Rescue Services water officer on 01992 507507 or <a href="mailto:water@hertfordshire.gov.uk">water@hertfordshire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>The comments made by this Fire Authority do not prejudice any further requirements that may be necessary to comply with the Building Regulations.</p> <p>We hope the above information assists you and if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>   |
| <p>Crime Prevention Design Advisor</p>  | <p>Thank you for sight of planning application Reference: 23/02876/MPI</p> <p>Proposal: Demolition of the existing school building and construction of new replacement school building with MUGA, all weather pitch, landscaping, and parking<br/>Address: Blessed Cuthbert Mayne Roman Catholic School Clover Way Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 3EA.</p> <p>I have discussed crime prevention and secured by design with the architects, and I am content that security measures have been implemented for this development</p>   |
| <p>Health And Safety</p>                | <p>From the information you have provided for this planning application, it does not appear to fall under the remit of planning gateway one because the purpose of a relevant building has not been met.</p>   |
| <p>Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC)</p> | <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above site, received on 13 December 2023. We have reviewed the application as submitted and wish to make the following comments.</p> <p>This is a full application for the demolition of existing school building and construction of new replacement school building with MUGA, all weather pitch, landscaping and parking.</p> <p>We object to this planning application in the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) &amp; Drainage Strategy relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is not following drainage hierarchy.</li> <li>• Cv value is less than 1. Therefore the volume of storage may need to be increased.</li> <li>• No SuDS system is being incorporated, use of oversized pipes and tanks used for discharge to a surface water sewer.</li> </ul> |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
|               | <p>Reason</p> <p>To prevent flooding in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 173, 175 and 180 by ensuring the satisfactory management of local flood risk, surface water flow paths, storage and disposal of surface water from the site in a range of rainfall events and ensuring the SuDS proposed operates as designed for the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>We will consider reviewing this objection if the following issues are adequately addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although the site is within Source Protection Zone 1 infiltration can be adopted in some areas of the site with certain mitigation measures, the hierarchy of surface water drainage system needs to be followed if BRE365 infiltration test results are found to be favourable for infiltration.</li> <li>2. SuDS features such as rain gardens, permeable pavements without lining can be introduced in areas.</li> <li>3. CV value used for modelling should be 1 and any value less than this is not acceptable.</li> <li>4. Manhole pipes S1.005, S1.001 and S1.000 provided are 1500mm which is highly oversized and cannot be considered a sustainable option for surface water drainage.</li> <li>5. There needs to be more clarity on the impermeable area of the proposed site as drainage calculations and report given shows different values.</li> <li>6. SuDS features and attenuation storage need to be included for the new building, parking, MUGA and sports pitches.</li> </ol> <p>Informative</p> <p>For further advice on what we expect to be contained within the FRA to support a planning application, please refer to our Developers Guide and Checklist on our surface water drainage webpage <a href="https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/water/surface-water-drainage/surface-water-drainage.aspx">https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/water/surface-water-drainage/surface-water-drainage.aspx</a> this link also includes HCC's policies on SuDS in Hertfordshire.</p> |
| Sport England | Summary  |

#### Statutory consultee role

Sport England raises no objection to this application as a statutory consultee which is considered to meet exception 5 of our adopted Playing Fields Policy and paragraph 99 of the NPPF subject to two planning conditions being imposed relating to the following matters as set out in this response:

- Multi-Use Games Area and Artificial Grass Pitch Design Specifications.
- Community Use Agreement.

#### Non-statutory consultee role

- Advisory comments are made on technical issues such as hours of use and noise.

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above application.

#### Sport England - Statutory consultee role and policy

We understand that you have consulted us as a statutory consultee in line with the above Order. Therefore, we have considered the application in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular paragraph 99, and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy, which is presented within our 'Playing Fields Policy and Guidance Document': [www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy](http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy)

Sport England's policy is to oppose the granting of planning permission for any development which would lead to the loss of, or prejudice the use of:

- all or any part of a playing field, or
- land which has been used as a playing field land remains undeveloped, or
- land allocated for use as a playing field

unless, in the judgement of Sport England the development as a whole meets with one or more of five specific exceptions. A summary of the exceptions is provided in the annex to this response.

#### The Proposal and its Impact on the playing field

In summary, the proposal involves the redevelopment of the St Cuthbert Mayne Catholic Junior School site to provide a new school building and external areas following the demolition of the existing school.

The proposed site layout would involve the new school building and external hard surfaced areas encroaching onto the existing playing field area to the south of the school site. The existing (MUGA) would be redeveloped and a new replacement facility would be sited to the west on the site of the existing school building following its demolition. A small artificial grass pitch would also be provided adjoining the MUGA to help mitigate the loss of the natural turf playing field area. The new school building would include the provision of a new school hall and an activity studio that could be used for indoor sports and physical activities such as dance, fitness etc. The school has offered community access to the new school's facilities outside of school hours.

Assessment against Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and NPPF

As the proposal includes new outdoor sports facilities that are intended to mitigate the impact on the playing field and MUGA it can be considered against exception 5 of the above policy (see Annex to this response). I have therefore assessed the proposal against the above policy to determine whether the proposals meet exception 5.

Sports Related Benefits

- **MUGA:** A new fenced multi-use games area (MUGA) with a porous macadam surface and line markings for formal sport (such as netball) would be provided to the west of the new school building. While smaller than the existing MUGA that it would replace, it would offer the benefit of having a flat surface, multi-sports markings for tennis, netball and basketball and ball stop perimeter fencing. The existing MUGA has a sloping surface and no perimeter fencing which means it cannot be secured and PE lessons are disrupted due to ball retrieval. The qualitative benefits of the new MUGA would therefore be considered to offset the net reduction in the size of the MUGA especially as a complementary artificial grass pitch is proposed that will provide an alternative all weather surface.
- **Artificial Grass Pitch:** The proposed artificial grass pitch with a 3G surface could offer significant benefits to the school and the community as it would provide an alternative all weather sports facility that would be suitable for pitch sports and would be available for use during periods of the academic year that the natural turf playing field is unavailable for use. While not suitable for competitive use due to its limited size it would be suitable for informal use for educational purposes and for football training. It would offer a complementary surface to the macadam surfaced MUGA which is not suitable for sports such as football.
- **Indoor Facilities:** The proposed school hall and activity studio would

be suitable for indoor sports/activities and would be superior in quality to the existing indoor facilities and the layout of the school building would be designed to support community use.

- Community Use: All of the new facilities would be made available for community use outside of school hours. There is understood to be no current community use of the existing school facilities and many of these facilities are not suitable for meeting community needs in terms of their quality, design or siting. The new facilities, especially the artificial grass pitch and the school hall/activity studio would be attractive for potential community use and could help meet local community needs for such facilities. The location of the artificial grass pitch and the MUGA on the frontage of the new school would be conducive to supporting community use of these facilities. Community use would need to be secured over a long term period through a community use agreement for this benefit to be delivered however.

#### Playing Field Impact

In relation to the impact on the playing field, area of the school's playing field that would be lost to the south of the existing school building offers limited potential to be marked out for a range of playing pitches due to its restricted size and shape although it appears to have been used for marking out pitches in practice in the past such as mini soccer pitches. The main body of playing fields to the east of the school which is marked out for a football pitch in the winter would not be affected by the redevelopment of the school. The existing MUGA would be lost but would be replaced with a MUGA and an artificial grass pitch as part of the development as set out above.

There would be temporary impacts on the outdoor sports facilities during the construction period as set out in the phasing proposals. In particular, for a 5 month period during phase 1 there would be no access to the playing fields and MUGA while the new school building is constructed and for a further 9 month period during phase 2, the school will not have access to a MUGA while the new MUGA and artificial grass pitch is constructed. During these periods, the school propose to use their school hall for meeting their PE needs. No community use would be affected during this temporary period.

Based on the above assessment I consider that the sport related benefits associated with the new school's facilities would outweigh the detriment caused by the impact on the existing playing field and MUGA. The proposal would therefore be considered to accord with exception 5 of the above policy.



### Sport England's Position

Given the above, Sport England raises no objection to the application because it is considered to accord with exception 5 of our Playing Fields Policy and paragraph 99 of the NPPF. This position is strictly subject to the following conditions being attached to the decision notice should the local planning authority be minded to approve the application:

- **Multi Use Games Area and Artificial Grass Pitch Design Specifications:** As the detailed technical specifications for the MUGA and artificial grass pitch are not available at this stage, details will need to be submitted prior to commencement of development of the MUGA and artificial grass pitch to demonstrate that the detailed design these facilities is fit for purpose and meets Sport England's design guidance in practice. The specifications should at least include specification details of the surface, fencing and line markings. This condition is justified to ensure that the facilities do deliver the benefits to sport identified above which mitigate the impact on the playing field. It is requested that the following condition and informative be imposed on any planning permission to address this matter (which is based condition 9a of our model conditions schedule [https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing\\_fields\\_policy](https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy)) :

"No development shall commence of the multi-use games area or the artificial grass pitch hereby permitted until the design specifications of the multi-use games area and artificial grass pitch, including details of surfacing,, line marking and fencing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority [after consultation with Sport England]. The multi-use games area and artificial grass pitch shall not be constructed other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development is fit for purpose and sustainable and to accord with Development Plan Policy

Informative: The applicant is advised that the design and layout of the multi-use games area and artificial grass pitch should comply with Sport England's Artificial Surfaces for Outdoor Sports Design Guidance

- **Community Use Agreement:** A condition requiring a community use agreement for the school's facilities to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority (in consultation with Sport England) prior to first occupation of the multi-use games area or artificial grass pitch in order to ensure that community access to the school's sports facilities are secured in practice. A community use

agreement sets out a school/college's policy and arrangements for community use of its sports facilities and covers matters such as hours of use, types of bookings accepted, restrictions on community use etc. The agreement is usually between a school/college and the relevant local authority (i.e. Dacorum Borough Council) but other bodies can be parties. Sport England regularly secures the completion of such agreements through planning conditions on planning permissions for school developments. Such a condition is justified to avoid a scenario where community access (outside of school hours) to the facilities does not take place (or is significantly restricted) following the implementation of the proposed development and to ensure that the community use arrangements are safe and well managed. Without suitable community access being secured over a long term period in practice, one of the principal sports development benefits of the proposals which mitigates the impact of the development on the sports facilities would not be realised. A community use agreement also provides clarity and formalisation with respect to community access arrangements for all parties. Community use agreement templates, examples of completed agreements and further advice can be provided upon request although advice should be sought from both Dacorum Borough Council and Sport England before an agreement is prepared. The following condition is requested to be imposed to address this which is based on model condition 16 of our model conditions schedule [www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy](http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy):

"No occupation of the multi-use games area or the artificial grass pitch hereby permitted shall commence until a community use agreement prepared in consultation with Sport England has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and a copy of the completed approved agreement has been provided to the Local Planning Authority. The agreement shall apply to the school hall, activity studio, multi-use games area, artificial grass pitch and supporting ancillary facilities and include details of pricing policy, hours of use, access by non-educational establishment users, management responsibilities and a mechanism for review, and anything else which the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Sport England considers necessary in order to secure the effective community use of the facilities. The development shall not be used at any time other than in strict compliance with the approved agreement.

Reason: To secure well managed safe community access to the sports facility/facilities, to ensure sufficient benefit to the development of sport and to accord with Development Plan Policy"

If the LPA is minded to approve the application without imposing the above conditions then Sport England objects to the application as it is

not considered to accord with any of the exceptions to our Playing Fields Policy or paragraph 99 of the NPPF. If you wish to amend the wording of the conditions or use another mechanism in lieu of the conditions, please contact us to discuss. Sport England does not object to amendments to conditions, provided they achieve the same outcome and we are involved in any amendments.

Should the local planning authority be minded to approve this application without the above conditions, then given Sport England's subsequent objection the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021 requires the application to be referred to the Secretary of State via the National Planning Casework Unit.

#### Sport England - Non Statutory Role and Policy

The Government, within their Planning Practice Guidance (Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities Section) advises Local Planning Authorities to consult Sport England on a wide range of applications.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space>

Sport England assesses this type of application in line with its planning objectives and with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Sport England's planning objectives are to PROTECT existing facilities, ENHANCE the quality, accessibility and management of existing facilities, and to PROVIDE new facilities to meet demand. Further advice is provided in Sport England's Planning for Sport guidance which can be found here: <https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-for-sport-guidance/>.

As a non-statutory consultee, without prejudice to our position as a statutory consultee set out above, Sport England would wish to make advisory comments on the following matters:

#### Hours of Use

The proposal for the MUGA and artificial grass pitch to be made available for community use outside of school hours is welcomed as this will offer potential to help meet community needs as set out above. While Sport England would not require a planning condition to be imposed relating to the hours of use of these facilities, it is acknowledged that the Council may wish to impose such a condition in order to address potential impact on residential amenity or the environment. If planning permission is granted, it is recommended that any condition that may be imposed by the Council relating to the hours

of use of the lighting and the use of the AGP is not overly restrictive in order to avoid prejudicing community use of the facilities. If the Council wishes to impose a planning condition restricting the hours of use of the facilities, consideration should be given to using condition 14 from our model conditions schedule.

It should be noted that if the Council sought to impose significant restrictions on the hours of use of these facilities this may affect our position on the planning application as the potential sport related benefits would be diminished. If such an approach is to be taken it is requested that Sport England be advised before the planning application is determined to provide an opportunity to review our position on the planning application.

#### Noise

If noise generated from the use of the MUGA and artificial grass pitch is an issue in the determination of the planning application, Sport England has published a guidance note on the planning implications of artificial grass pitch acoustics. This is intended to aid in developing a more consistent approach when assessing the noise associated with artificial grass pitch use and to provide some rules of thumb when assessing noise impact. If applicable, it is recommended that this guidance is considered to inform any assessment of noise impact as it has been tailored to assist with the consideration of this issue. This can be downloaded from our website at <https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/outdoor-surfaces>.

If this application is to be presented to a Planning Committee, we would like to be notified in advance of the publication of any committee agendas, report(s) and committee date(s). We would be grateful if you would advise us of the outcome of the application by sending us a copy of the decision notice.

Please note that this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.

If you would like any further information or advice, please contact the undersigned

22/02/24

As advised in our formal response dated 15th December 2023 to the consultation on the above planning application, we requested that Sport England be advised before the application was determined if the Council was considering imposing restrictions on the hours of use of the MUGA or the artificial grass pitch. Seeking our comments on the

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
|              | <p>proposed hours of use of these facilities is therefore welcomed.</p> <p>The proposed hours of use based on what the Council considers to be acceptable to protect the amenity of neighbouring residential dwellings would allow some community use of the MUGA and the artificial grass pitch after school hours in the late afternoon and early evening period which would cover part of the peak period for community use of such facilities. As the facilities are not to be supported by floodlighting, the use of them after 19.00 would be restricted for most of the year anyway by the lack of daylight even if a condition was not imposed. The proposed hours of use on Saturday and Sunday would also allow community use during a substantial proportion of the weekend peak period as well. I am therefore satisfied that while potential community use of the facilities would be restricted in the evenings for part of the year and in the afternoons during weekends, that there would still be sufficient opportunities for community use to deliver the benefits to sport outlined in our original response and for the school to generate revenue that could be used towards the maintenance of these facilities.</p> <p>I can therefore confirm that no objection would be made to a condition being imposed on any planning permission restricting the hours of use of these facilities to those set out in your email. Our position on the application as set out in our formal response dated 15th December 2023 would therefore still apply. The hours of use of these facilities set out in a future community use agreement (that would be submitted at a later date to meet the requirements of the requested planning condition) would need to align with the permitted hours of use of the MUGA and the artificial grass pitch set out in the decision notice.</p> <p>The proposed hours of operation of the MUGA and the artificial grass pitch will need to be extended to cover school use of the facilities during Monday to Friday as the hours of use proposed do not permit use before 15.00 which I presume is unintentional. I would recommend against having separate hours of operation in a planning condition for school and community use of these facilities as this is likely to prove to be inflexible from an operational perspective and difficult to practically monitor and enforce e.g. difficulties in distinguishing between after school clubs run by the school from community club use.</p> <p>Please treat this response as being supplementary to our original formal response.</p> |
| Thames Water | <p>Waste Comments</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such</p>  |

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.

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.

With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Management of surface water from new developments should follow guidance under sections 167, 168 & 169 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. <https://www.thameswater.co.uk/help/home-improvements/how-to-connect-to-a-sewer/sewer-connection-design>

Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.

#### Water Comments

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.

The applicant is advised that their development boundary falls within a Source Protection Zone for groundwater abstraction. These zones may be at particular risk from polluting activities on or below the land surface. To prevent pollution, the Environment Agency and Thames Water (or other local water undertaker) will use a tiered, risk-based approach to regulate activities that may impact groundwater resources. The applicant is encouraged to read the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection (available at

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements</a>) and may wish to discuss the implication for their development with a suitably qualified environmental consultant.</p> |
|--|---|

## APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

### Number of Neighbour Comments

| Neighbour Consultations | Contributors | Neutral | Objections | Support |
|-------------------------|--------------|---------|------------|---------|
| 35                      | 24           | 1       | 13         | 10      |

### Neighbour Responses

| Address  | Comments  |
|--|---|
| <p>50 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>We're not averse to the redevelopment of the school and understand the need for the rebuild however we strongly feel the proposed design is inconsiderate to its surroundings, outlook and specifically no regard to residents neighbouring the boundary</p> <p>We felt the supposed 'Public Consultation' was a fishing exercise and target approach to specific residents to extrapolate concerns, at no point were the residents who sent in statements to the school or attended the meeting and completed feedback forms advised their comments and concerns would be used against them in the application or to generate reports for the sole use of the planner and builder to produce reports to strongly rebut the genuine concerns of the residents prior to submitting and aiding the planning application. Due to several residents in Betjeman Way not receiving leaflets advising of the 'fishing exercise' we feel this should not be classed as a "Public Consultation"</p> <p>Those who did attend were all told conflicting information and lied to regarding specific concerns raised. The consensus by the Residents is we were baited into this process, which has caused a lack of trust with the designer, builders and St Cuthbert Mayne School</p> <p>It is requested the document ST_CUTHBERTS_SCI_NOVEMBER_2023-1448928 and all corresponding reports generated after the 12/10/23 and referenced within the report be carefully considered by the honorable planning committee and be kindly deferred until an open, honest, and inclusive Public Consultation be held</p> |

From the documentation in the planning application, it's clear the design was rushed to fast track the application. The building design should have been developed to consider the neighboring residents, as the builders did when planning Betjeman Way. The houses were all positioned so they did not overlook the school or effect privacy, Betjeman Way residents who border the school are requesting the same consideration and courtesy as this build will affect our Outlook, Right to Light, privacy, everyday lives and mental health for years to come. Not to mention the noise and light pollution this new position will cause. The simple solution would be to consider the orientation of the building, turning the whole building with all the noisy, foul, and intrusive services to the Southern aspect where the only neighbouring property would be an educational facility

Turning the school would eradicate any noise created from the Gym and Recreation Hall and be less intrusive to the residents whilst the Air Handling Units and smells from the Kitchens would be addressed. It would address the issue surrounding intrusive lighting from high level Gym windows to neighbouring homes outside of school hours. The positioning of the New Substation away from Residential Housing could be achieved.

We request the honorable planning committee reject the planning application in its current form and request a feasibility study be carried out to determine if rotating the new school building would alleviate concerns raised by residents. Alternately moving the building away from the residents to the Southern boundary line could also help with the design in keeping the school playground and playing fields next to each other as the new position doesn't make sense and will make activities hard to manage especially as the current position works so well unlike the new design.

Electrical Sub-Station design, supply, and installation of an Electrical Substation within approximately 5m of the Gardens of 50, 41, & 38 Betjeman Way. The issue was raised at the meeting and all parties avoided giving accurate answers and some residents were advised it was "some sort of storage building" We've now learnt it's an Electrical Substation from the application so another outright lie. It's a fact, Substations do make a noise. It's a consistent humming noise residents will be exposed to 24/7/365. Government legislation and environmental legislation has been developed specifically due to noise nuisance generated by Substations. It is estimated the Substation will be within 5m of the nearest properties boundary. Our concerns are the EMF's emitted by the Substation can raise the risk of developing health problems when placed close to people and buildings, this is another reason the services should be moved away from the residents. With my Husband recovering from cancer, my children, elderly residents and I so close to the Substation, this in itself should be reason enough to relocate the building and the Substation away from resident's homes.

Right to Daylight 3D Modelling, the relevant document relates to shadowing report Reference: SRP1148-NOV-XX-XX-T-A-PL01-DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT-PART\_2-1448882, page 17. Within this report the architect has



carried out calculations based on BRE guidance 2022 "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - A Guide to Good Practice" which states: This guidance clearly states if the distance of the new development is more than three times its height above the lowest window, the daylight is unlikely to be affected."

The architect has provided their calculations as follows: The overall height of the proposed building  $9.557\text{m} \times 3 = 28.671\text{m}$

We assume the Architects calculations are correct, however given the current lack of trust in the design team and the distance from the existing school to 50 Betjeman Way is circa 20m these calculations to the nearest properties must be taken with an element of trepidation as these calculations and distances are at the cusp of what is acceptable and if not accurate will affect the daylight to these properties as per BRE Guidance.

Right to Daylight 20+ years and our Right for Daylight. As residents of Betjeman Way for over 20 years we have grave concerns over our Right to Daylight. We strongly believe these reports are inaccurate and developed to force the application through planning. Our concern if planning is approved and the development goes ahead our Right to Daylight will be taken away. The planner should be writing to residents on the boundary and offering to pay reasonable fees for an Independent Surveyor of our choice to do the necessary checks on our behalf and report back to us with their finding, as this will impact our lives especially in the winter months.

Shadowing - Document MB/RD/31693, Page 42 and by their own admission shadowing will occur "The only impact would result in mid-winter, where due to the height of the sun there may be a heightened level of overshadowing on the neighbouring properties at certain times of day. However, the period of time this would occur taking into consideration the rest of the year is minimal"

The planner further admits "The impact would not be significant during spring or summer months and in this regard, it is not considered to represent material harm to the neighbouring residents" Our Emphasis on the word significant. The report clearly would indicate the neighbouring properties would have shadowing, however this is played down using the wording "not be significant." We would argue what the planners deem as "not significant" is irrelevant to the issue of shadowing and does not retract from the fact properties will suffer from overshadowing under the current proposal especially in winter months.

Overbearing overlook to the houses - The 3D imaging carried out by the planner in relation to the SEN room, Roof Access Door and adjacent windows overlooking 50 Betjeman Way which is an issue relating to Safeguarding of both the school children and our children.

Document

SRP1148-NOV-XX-XX-T-A-PL01-DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT-PART\_2-1448882 refers to various guidelines which we believe have not been accurately followed and indeed the report fabricated in favor of the planning application and to rebut residents' general

concerns.

In evidence the 3D images on page 22 clearly show an inaccuracy. Picture 1 shows a 3D image of the view from the SEN Resource Space looking over the flat roof to 50 Betjeman Way. Picture 2 a 3D image from the Small Group Room Upper window, which is further away than the SEN Room and further away from 50 Betjeman Way. The distance and heights are inaccurate. You would expect the window from the room furthest away (Small Group Room) would be represented accordingly within these 3D images, this is not the case with this window appearing to be nearer to the property than the view from the actual closest window (SEN Resource Space). We do not believe these reports are accurate and believe they have been fabricated to rebut the genuine concerns of residents.

Social Value - St Cuthbert Mayne Catholic Junior School is not a community school with applicants requiring a letter from a Priest to obtain a place, hence many students residing outside the area and being driven to school via its feeder school in Boxmoor. This adds additional congestion to the already heavily congested community of Gadebridge and Gadebridge Road. As is not a community school and many children in the local area do not have access to the school or its facilities, it raises the question under the banner of "Social Value" what commitments have been made for the "community of Gadebridge.

Air Handling Units, design, supply, and installation of 2no Air Handling Units (AHU) to the low-level roof on the Northern aspect. Initial advice by the builder these were kitchen extracts and would be facing away from properties to the South. Again this was an attempt to appease the planning committee and residents and will not work as the exhaust will be hitting the SEN Room and school itself and therefore deflecting, causing more noise. The noise characteristic of an AHU is a throbbing or in some cases a humming sound. If installed at the highest points of a building and above neighboring buildings these sounds would probably be negated, however in contrast the AHU's are being installed on the lower flat roof to the Northwest aspect and are below or at least level with our properties, therefore noise will be radiated direct into our gardens and windows. It is common knowledge the noise generated by industrial AHU's is not conducive to being installed near private dwellings and why most developers install them away from private dwellings at the highest points, i.e. on roofs. The Planning Application even recognizes this by advising their intention to install attenuators and vibration mounts to dampen the noise. Residents of Betjeman Way will be exposed to this noise nuisance 24/7/365.

Plantroom - The positioning of 3no Plantrooms to the Northwest of the school, closest to residents. Unfortunately, there is currently no detail what will be installed within the plantroom/s, however we can assume plant will include, hot water service pumps, cold water service pumps, low temperature heating service pumps, pressurization equipment, filtration systems, Ground Source Heat Pumps, Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS) and Electrical Distribution. We can appreciate the plantrooms will have louvred doors however again noise will be generated, this is unavoidable in any building, hence why boiler houses are positioned intentionally away from residential dwellings.

Ground Source Heat Network and Pumps - The supply and installation of Ground Source Heat Network and the installation of Ground Source Heat Pumps (GSHP). We were advised specifically by the builder the heat network was to be installed away from residential housing to the West of the site under the MUGA pitches and all pipework underground straight to the plantroom. This has now changed so the heat network pipework will be installed in the lower field and pipework running adjacent to our boundaries to the GSHP. We assume no noise will be generated from the underground pipework. We were further advised of several different positions of the GSHP, from Southern Aspect to Northern Aspect, to even underground and most recently to the rear of the school (Clients Planner email dated 31/10/23 refers). On receiving the plans these are now to be installed in the plantroom at the front of the school to the Northwest position (residential side). This just evidences again the conflicting information the residents have been told and advised of and the lack of thought which has gone into the design. It is accepted providing they are properly maintained, GSHP are quieter than Air Source Heat Pumps, however, will still generate an element of noise. Our concern is coupled with all the other services to the Northern aspect of the school, these services will contribute to an overall noise issue for the residents.

Sump Pump - The supply and installation of a Sump Pump at the far East of the car park and adjacent 50 Betjeman Way. The sump pump being installed close to residential properties will cause an element of noise. Why is this not being installed on the school side away from residents?

Main Hall & Recreation Room - The positioning of the Main Hall & Recreation Room will be used for Sports and School Events including Concerts and Disco's. It's the school's intention for the facilities to be used by the community until 10pm all year round. The noise generated within the Gym would result in noise nuisance from balls bouncing, whistles, shouting and music. Residents will be exposed to the noise all year round. It is within 20m of the nearest resident's boundary and would subject many residents to unnecessary noise levels throughout the year. Another lie as residents were told it would not be used outside of school hours.

Screening to All Weather Pitches (AWP) - The design, supply, and construction of the AWP and its use by the community in the summer months to sunset, at the latest circa 10pm. The noise generated from these pitches would result in noise nuisance from balls bouncing, whistles and shouting. We were advised by the Builder, an acoustic screen was to be installed on the Northern Fence facing the Betjeman Way properties. The plans now only show the acoustic screen to the West of the pitches facing the flats. Residents to the north of the pitches will be exposed to this noise nuisance throughout the year, outside of school hours and on weekends. Again we were lied to about the usage when concerns were raised.

Bin Store/Waste Collection The new position of the Bin Store will be closer to the residents than the current position, again the designers have given no consideration to the proximity of neighbouring homes on

the boundary and the smell generated from school bins will be within meters of existing properties gardens throughout the year and will be worse in the summer. There is an honest concern regarding the infestation of rodents into nearby gardens and sheds as the school has had rat infestations in the past. Not to mention the noise from the waste lorries collecting waste and turning a few meters from the nearest properties boundary.

Deliveries - residents will be exposed to delivery vehicles outside of school hours with the turning head for all delivery vehicles within a few meters of the nearest boundary.

Light Pollution from High Level Gym Windows - The installation of High-Level windows in the Gym. Outside of school hours the Gym being used by the wider community. These high-level windows will produce light pollution outside of school hours and will affect properties to the Northern aspect up to 10pm at night.

Kitchen Extract - It's a given any industrial kitchen will generate a level of noise and smell. The extracts are to be positioned to the Northern Aspect of the School towards the residents of Betjeman Way. The Architect and Builder have acknowledged there will be odors generated by the kitchens and to try and alleviate this have advised the extracts will be pointed away from neighboring properties to the South. We do not see how this will resolve the smells generated having a direct impact on our lives. We are concerned we will not be able to open windows and doors throughout school terms without our homes and furnishings being overcome with school kitchen smells and odors.

Dust - I'm an Asthmatic on a Steroid Inhaler with many elderly residents elderly having breathing difficulties. Whilst we accept dust will be generated during construction this will be minimal compared to when the demolition works commence. To allow residents of Betjeman way to still be able to open windows, doors and use their gardens during the summer months, we request consideration for all demolition works be carried out during the damper months of the year in the winter. We further request to keep the dust levels down, all methods of dust control be implemented to ensure dust is kept to an absolute minimum and to reduce the risk to residents.

Welfare - The relevant comment relates to the Construction Phase Plan (CPP)

SRP1148-TDC-XX-XX-T-X-003-ConstructionPhasePlan-P05-S5 page 54, November 2023, clearly shows the Welfare Units on the Boundary of 50/51 Betjeman Way. This is at odds with document MB/RD/31693 - NOVEMBER 2023, page 44.

The welfare cabins have been sighted with no consideration for the residents. The welfare units could easily be sighted to the South or East of the proposed development, not impacting on the lives of the residents Clover Way or Betjeman Way. Instead the builder is sighting 2no double height welfare units, with windows overlooking into existing residential properties. They have given no details or locations of any Sub-Contractors site cabins or any storage containers.

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Construction Deliveries - The Construction Phase Plan (CPP) and site operating hours being 07:30 to 18:00 Monday to Friday with deliveries during school holidays from 07:30 to 17:30. The CPP states "After 19.00 by arrangement - deliveries will not be noisy and will cause no disruption to local residents." This is an inaccurate statement as the builder cannot predict whether a delivery will be noisy or not. Again, the planning application has inaccuracies and conflicting information. Government guidelines are from 08:00 to 18:00 and request these be adhered to.</p> <p>We do not accept deliveries being made outside these hours and will make official complaints to the regulating authority if guidelines are not followed.</p> <p>The CPP notes throughout the construction period hoarding will be used to enclose the construction site. "The recommended height for hoarding is 2.4m, although a height of at least 2m will be suitable for most building sites. However for construction sites located in city centres or where children might attempt to gain access, high-security hoarding, or a high-security fence (both 3m) might be more suitable." Again, this was not raised at the meeting. Residents will not only be exposed to these construction works for the next 2 years however will also be exposed to 3m hoarding along our boundaries (emphasis on children gaining access) for a considerable period, with some residents looking at greater than two years if the works do not go to programme. We request Heras fencing to be considered along the Northern Boundary and positioned at least 5m away.</p> <p>Clover Way - Issue of parking and restricted parking to include the builders request for Double Yellow line which will be imposed on 21 homes in Clover Way and the surrounding area. Further parking restrictions of the residents will result in more cars parking on Gadebridge Road which will be a danger to school children walking to the three neighbouring schools. We suggest as part of the social value the builders convert the grass verge in Clover Way into resident parking.</p> <p>Construction Parking - The Construction Phase Plan (CPP). It's noted in the CPP there is no onsite parking for Sub-Contractors and the Queensway Car Park to be used. Concerns are construction works will cause an overspill onto Gadebridge Lane and Gadebridge Road causing dangerous parking especially during the summer. The overspill already causes issues for residents and emergency vehicles gaining access.</p> |
| <p>1 Lyrical Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HZ</p> | <p>I am in support of the proposed rebuilding of the school for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The school building is over sixty years old and predates the residential buildings along Betjeman Way by more than thirty years. Today's legislation around safeguarding, accessibility, Health &amp; Safety and sustainability are substantially different to those in place when the school was built at the end of the 1950s.</li> <li>2. The building has the original, large, single glazed Crittall frame</li> </ol>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>windows. Being single glazed means they are not energy efficient and would not be used in schools today. The emphasis now is on sustainability, energy efficiency and making use of alternatives so that buildings have a net zero effect on the environment.</p> <p>3. The front entrance does not provide adequate safeguarding for those inside. There is no visitor control into the school - once a person is in the building they can access any area of the school.</p> <p>4. Access to the building is difficult for anyone with mobility issues. The front entrance has the option of a steep slope or steps up to the front door. Wheelchair users have to access the building through one of the classrooms. The school is built over two floors with a central staircase to the lower floor. Anyone having difficulty using the stair case would have to exit the building through a classroom and go round the building and enter through a classroom on the lower floor.</p> <p>5. Currently vehicles, including delivery, refuse or ambulance, have to either reverse through the gate onto the site or reverse out of the site - there is no room for vehicles to turn around to be able to drive off the site. There is a potential risk to pedestrians or other vehicles/users when large vehicles are accessing the site.<br/>The inclusion of a turning circle within the plan would make it safer for all concerned.</p> <p>The amount of work required to make the existing building fit for purpose would not be money well spent. To rebuild the school would provide an enhanced learning environment for pupils and the staff that work there and greater opportunities for community use of the facilities.</p> |
| <p>72 Belswains Lane<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP3 9PP</p>   | <p>Whilst conscious of potential disruption to close residents during the build period, I support the continued development of the school. This will enhance the learning capabilities provided within and ensure longevity for future students at SCM.</p>   |
| <p>170 St Agnells Lane<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP2 6EQ</p> | <p>I support the application to demolish the existing building and create a new school building because the current building is not fit for purpose, concrete is crumbling in several places, the metal window frames cause drafts and do not fit properly and security at Reception is inadequate. Our children deserve better. There is no good reason why the school should not be re-built.</p>   |
| <p>3 Chaulden Terrace<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 2AN</p>  | <p>The school is in need of redevelopment and the approach of building a new school whilst the old one is still operational is a tried and tested method with new school builds.</p> <p>As far as I can tell the design of the new school has come up with the best option of using the site - whilst still allowing landscaping around the school. The site of the sports pitch is in a good position and will not be in constant use - even if used in the evenings - so I don't think it will exceed any noise polluting barriers. In fact, it will offer a great asset for local community groups and something that should be positively encouraged.</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>Allowing children to thrive in a positive learning environment should be celebrated and these plans seem to offer the children of this school a great start in the world.</p>  |
| <p>49 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>Living directly adjacent to the school, it will have an extreme affect on our privacy and quality of life during this period of construction and demolition. The new build will be directly looking into the rear of our bedrooms and garden which again will affect our standard of life. We have not been informed how long the construction will take and we assume the site will be worked on seven days a week. The impact of the larger car park and noise will also affect us. Will there be flood lights around the building and consideration to residents when events etc are undertaken by the school.</p>  |
| <p>53 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>I am writing to object to the plans regarding the complete overhaul of the school. Whilst I agree with upgrading and progress with facilities, these plans are ill thought through with little regard for the surrounding neighbours.</p> <p>Objection 1 - Noise Disturbance<br/>The proximity of the bin storage area, plant room and kitchen ventilation equipment to the rear are likely to bring unpleasant noises that are not currently present disrupting neighbours on the boundary.</p> <p>Refuse bins being filled, moved and emptied by large noisy bin lorries frequently throughout the school day and, potentially, at other times out of school hours. The heating and ventilation equipment will emit noise when operating and this may be during the night.</p> <p>I believe the citing of these waste bins and machinery close to mine and other Betjeman Way homes will be a huge disturbance.</p> <p>Objection 2 - the all weather pitches which will be used all year round and to the public until 10pm in the summer, pose huge noise disruption of both traffic, when the games when are in session and the starting and ending of matches.</p> <p>There would also be additional air pollution for the surrounding neighbours with additional cars coming and going for longer hours throughout the day and evening.</p> <p>I object to the plans for those main reasons.</p> |
| <p>51 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>Firstly I would like to emphasise that no-one is disputing the need to update the existing school nor wish to stop it, all objections are made from local residents who will be adversely affected by the new plan and consider that Tilbury Douglas have failed to consider the residents and the local community that use the existing roads and footpaths to access numerous schools in the area.</p> <p>Secondly I would like to state that the timing of this application demonstrates Tilbury Douglas's attitude towards the local residents generally as it is extremely premeditated to coincide with the business family period of the year, and subsequently very underhand. Not</p>   |

helped by the ridiculously short Public Comment period ending tomorrow, I have had to take time out of family time on New Years Eve to make my comments as a last resort- its extremely inconsiderate.

I live bordering St Cuthbert Mayne School and my back garden overlooks the car park currently, we have lived here for over 30 years in peace and tranquility alongside the school.

We are devastated to now have that shattered by the prospect of a two year construction and demolition project, not to mention site huts and toilet facilities at the end of our garden, and then the subsequent repositioning of sports facilities, substations and plant rooms that will affect us. The whole prospect is incredibly upsetting.

At this point I would like to state that I attended the 'Public Consultation' which was not at public as very few people actually knew about it, not even the local councillors, one of whom attended because I contacted them, not because they had been made aware.

Not all residents of Betjeman Way received a leaflet, and certainly some who are directly affected were not aware of the build proposal or consultation. I also consider one week in advance extremely poor notice, (yet again). In addition there are no to scale Architect drawings only artists impressions and rough drawings to demonstrate perceived locations.

At this 'Public Consultation' I spoke to the person in charge of the construction part, who emphasised in no uncertain terms, that site hours would be 8am to 5pm and categorically NO weekend working. I am shocked to see working hours stated in the Planning Statement are 7.30-18.00 no mention of weekends. This is unacceptable, and we do not accept the need for weekend working. Hiding the welfare units behind the trees at the end of my garden will not stop me being disturbed in my garden by construction workers using the facilities and toilets (ugh) and the noise and smells associated with this kind of temporary structure. I WOULD ASK THAT THESE BE PLACED AWAY FROM RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES PLEASE, at least the toilets and canteen area.

My main issues with the build are

1. Noise, from both the MUGA and AWP, from the substation and the plant associated with the GSHP. There are constant references to community use, the noise from the sports pitches will be extremely detrimental to our health and enjoyment of our garden, no amount of 'acoustic fencing' will stop the noise of its use, the whistles, shouting, traffic out of school hours as constantly mentioned. The Impact of the siting of these facilities will ABSOLUTELY be harmful to neighbouring properties despite what Tilbury Douglas' survey said. Section 3.2.4 mentions the placement of the MUGA will allow easy access to the public, yet further on it says it is for school use only, which is it? if either of these pitches are made available for public use then we are looking at constant noise from them day and night, in the Summer months when we will be using our garden we will be subject to after school clubs and potentially adult football teams using the pitches, and then if that is successful they will want to floodlight them. Point 6.8.9 accepts



there will be increased noise levels, currently the positioning of the AWP means a lots of homes are shielded by the existing building from noise pollution but the proposed build means we will be facing it with nothing but a silly fence and a few trees- (which we do not want as the current trees along the northern border have been allowed to grow to an unacceptable height impacting on our daylight into our homes and gardens) The school already entertain a number of clubs in the school holidays so there will be no respite from the noise, shouting/whistles/traffic etc is not acceptable at 21.30/22.00 on a Summers evening, why should we suddenly have to tolerate it?

Another point is one of child protection- the pitches will be overlooked by the flats in Clover Way.

My point here is that these pitches do not need to be placed near the residential areas when there is an expanse of field to the South and East of the build, Sport England should allow for some of this to be used in consideration of the residents. 50-55db is not acceptable when one is trying to relax in their own home.

Again under Noise- the plant room and GSHP plant will emit a constant hum, I understand the published acceptable level of noise in 43Db but that will be prevalent to us residents- a constant noise that is not currently present, I will be able to hear it in my garden, my office and my bedrooms three of four are at the rear of my property- why are they being placed near the residential area when there is so much space the other side of the build? Despite the noise surveys, this will be a constant low level noise and will be detrimental to my mental health along with the impact on our sleep, work and enjoyment of our garden.

I WOULD ASK THAT THESE BE MOVED AWAY FROM THE RESIDENTIAL AREAS.

2. I can see no Asbestos report even though it is stated in the statement that it was found in quantity when samples were taken. This concerns me.

3. Light Pollution, from the car park, the buildings, and potentially future applications to floodlight the MUGA or AWP.

The car park will be lit, there will be 'security lighting' 23.00-07.00- this will cause a great deal of light pollution to us, our rear facing bedrooms, living rooms, office and garden. there have been numerous historic planning application attempts to light the existing carpark and entrance and these have all been refused, due to the impact on our homes, why should this be any different? The level of lighting proposed will pollute the rear of our home and garden.

4. The lack of consideration for the footfall along the footpath lane that runs parallel to Gadebridge Rd and is used by children, students and parents of all the local schools, ALL of these will need to traverse the site entrance in Clover Way, pedestrians and construction traffic just will not mix, not to mention the mud etc deposited. I also object to yellow lines being placed in Clover Way to allow construction traffic easy access yet stopping residents parking outside their own homes? Again complete lack of consideration for local residents, this element of the plan was not widely mentioned at the 'Public Consultation'. The

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>traffic and parking along Gadebridge Rd will also make for interesting viewing when Construction traffic is added to the mix.</p> <p>I have run out of time having spent too many hours already, at the busiest time of my social and family calendar, but I would ask that the positioning of the sports facilities, the plant and the substation be moved away from the current proposed siting, away from the residential areas- there is so much space elsewhere, there is no need to upset the local residents and make life intolerant for us.</p>  |
| <p>37 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>While I understand the need for improvement to the current school facilities I object to the current plan for the following reasons.</p> <p>Objection to position of Transformer unit and Underground Source Heat pump, and bin store.</p> <p>The proposed plan shows a transformer room and bin store near to the northern boundary of the site and close to residential properties.</p> <p>There is reason to believe that a transformed and ground pump may emit annoying low level hum. This has the potential to be annoying to adjoining residential properties on the north boundary.</p> <p>The bin store is located nearby. There will be obvious noise generated when these are emptied / collected by commercial vehicles and there is likely to be strong unpleasant odours from this area, especially in the summer months.</p> <p>These facilities should be relocated away from any residential areas, I see no reason these cannot be positioned on the opposing side of the building away from the existing residential properties. This point in the plan shows a significant disregard to the properties neighbouring the school.</p> <p>Further to this, the proposal plans to shift the current school building backwards within the current plot closer to the residents on Betjeman Way, this will result in a shadow particularly in the winter months that is likely to extend into the gardens of the properties for large parts of the day.</p> <p>The plot the school sits on is significant and with some adjustment I am confident an agreement could be reached that satisfies the school and the residents of Betjeman Way and the surrounding roads.</p> |
| <p>52 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>Objection to car park - Grounds Noise pollution.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed plan to increase car parking on the school grounds and the new provision of vehicular 'drop off' point inside the school grounds at the school entrance.</p> <p>A few years ago the school extended its car park by about 8 cars and had to apply for retrospective planning permission which was granted.</p> <p>Obviously the more cars that park the more noise and pollution will be generated. The proposed car park is being moved nearer the northern</p>  |

boundary, so nearer to the residential properties.

There is no current drop off facility at the school, so the change in design to include one will mean potentially much more vehicular traffic will be entering the grounds to drop off and pick up, causing more noise to the residential area nearby.

The plan states there is provision to provide 3 disabled parking spaces. However the three disabled bays marked on the map are further away from the school entrance than some of the normal bays.

The amount of proposed parking appears to dominate the north eastern side of the plot and is excessive.

Objection to position of Transformer unit and Underground Source Heat pump, and bin store.

The proposed plan shows a transformer room and bin store near to the northern boundary of the site and close to residential properties.

There is insufficient information within the plan in relation to the noise generated by and from machinery housed in these units.

There is reason to believe that a transformed and ground pump may emit annoying low level hum. This will be very annoying to adjoining residential properties on the north boundary.

In addition the bin store is located nearby. There will be obvious noise generated when these are emptied / collected by commercial vehicles and there is likely to be strong unpleasant odours from this area, especially in the summer months.

These facilities should be relocated away from any residential areas, perhaps the east side that adjoins the park.

Objection to MUGA and AWP on account of noise pollution

I strongly object to the Multi Use Games Area and the All Weather Pitch being placed in the proposed location.

Both these facilities will be too close to the North and West boundaries both of which have residential properties and gardens bordering.

It is clear from the planning application that the football pitch will be available not only to the pupils but also the community outside school hours during daylight hours.

The noise survey completed as part of the application informs that during the summer months daylight hours can be up to 22.00 hrs. It also states that the type of noise generated can reach at least 54 db. Including shouting, whistle blowing, ball kicking, and other related activities.

The fact the space will be open to the community will impact the residents enormously. Normally the school is closed in the evening and for many weeks during the school holidays. With the proposed scheme the facility will be open to the whole community all year round, the noise

generated will severely impact on the peace and enjoyment of homes and gardens bordering the school.

The plan acknowledges this disruption and attempts to negate it by placing sound reducing fencing around the sides of the pitches. Whilst these panels may reduce some noise in normal circumstances, surely when placed around a games area, balls will be being kicked against them causing additional thuds and associated noise.

The location of these pitches should be moved to another location that does not border any residential properties.

I write to you regarding the above application that is to come before the planning committee in the next few weeks.

I reside at number 52 Betjeman Way and my property is one of three, with short rear gardens that back directly onto the north west corner of the proposed site.

Myself and my neighbour have resided here for over thirty years and have much enjoyed the peace and tranquility of the location, especially in the summer months when spending time in the garden.

I think we all appreciate the need to replace the current school with a modern more efficient building, however I am seriously concerned about the proposed siting of various aspects of the build, which will have an enormous impact on the properties on the north boundary and the lives of the occupants.

1. I understand that the build is set to take two years to complete and the site offices and toilets will be placed near the north boundary and the offices will comprise of stacked portacabins.

This means there will be unsightly temporary buildings (2 years) in full view of my garden, and obvious noise from employees working from and using the facilities from early morning.

2. The proposed site of the MUGA and AWP is also very close to the residential properties and may be in use until 10 pm in the summertime.

It is inevitable that the type of noise generated by the use of these facilities will impact on the peace and tranquility currently enjoyed by the local residents.

3. The positioning of generators and pumps near the boundary are also likely to generate annoying low level hum. And the refuse collection and storage point will also impact residents by both smell and noise generated by vehicles collecting bins and associated vehicle warning beepers.

It appears to me that many of the strongly felt objections to this application could and should be resolved, by the re positioning of all the above to the east side of the site as it borders Gadebridge Park and no residential properties, thus having far less impact.

I sincerely hope that the above points are not lost in the sea of planning

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>paperwork and yourself and the committee find the time to discuss and address concerns raised.</p> <p>If you would like to meet personally to discuss any point further please don't hesitate to get in touch.</p>  |
| <p>50 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>We are not averse to the redevelopment of the school; however, we strongly feel the design of the school has been fast-tracked and the design is inconsiderate to its surroundings and the local area. The current proposal has no regard for its setting and specifically the residents neighbouring to the Northern and Western Aspects.</p> <p>This was not a Public Consultation. This was a targeted approach to specific residents to extrapolate concerns for the sole use by the planner to produce reports to rebut those concerns prior to submitting the planning application. The consensus by residents is they were hoodwinked into this process.</p> <p>A Public Consultation should involve the Public and the Community, which was not the case. Several homeowners in both Betjeman Way, Clover Way and Gadebridge Road who would be directly affected by the development did not receive a leaflet and therefore were not invited or aware of the consultation.</p> <p>At no point were those who attended advised their comments &amp; concerns would be used in the application and reports generated to strongly rebut those concerns. Likewise, those surveyed were not advised their comments would be used within and to aid the planning application.</p> <p>Those who did attend were told conflicting information and lied to regarding specific concerns raised.</p> <p>It is requested the November 2023 SCI document and all corresponding reports generated after the event and referenced within the report be carefully considered and carefully reviewed by the planning committee and if required be deferred until an open, honest, and inclusive Public Consultation can be held.</p> <p>It is clear from the documentation within the planning application the design was rushed and fast tracked. The design of the building should have been developed with the Northern and Western residents considered. The solution to this would have been to reconsider the orientation of the building, turning the building 180 degrees on the new footprint with all the noisy, foul, and intrusive services to the Southern aspect where the only neighbouring properties would be that of another educational facility.</p> <p>In addition, turning the school 180 degrees would eradicate any noise created from the Gym and Recreation Hall and therefore be less intrusive to the residents whilst the noise from the Air Handling Units and smells from the Kitchens would also be addressed. The new substation could also be re-sighted.</p> <p>We therefore request the planning committee reject the planning</p> |

application in its current form and request a feasibility study be carried out to determine if rotating the new school building 180 degrees would alleviate several comments raised by residents.

Reasonings:

**Air Handling Units** - The relevant works relate to the design, supply, and installation of 2no Air Handling Units (AHU) to the low-level roof on the Northern aspect. Initial advice by the builder these were kitchen extracts, and they would be facing away from properties to the South. This was just an attempt to appease the planning committee and residents and will not work as the exhaust will be hitting the SEN Room and school itself and therefore deflecting, possibly causing more noise.

The noise characteristic of an AHU is a throbbing or in some cases a humming sound. If installed at the highest points of a building and above neighbouring buildings these sounds would be negligible, however in contrast the AHUs are being installed on the lower flat roof to the Northwest aspect and are below or at least level with our properties, therefore noise will be radiated direct into our gardens and windows. The noise generated by industrial AHU's is not conducive to being installed near private dwellings and why most developers install them away from private dwellings at the highest points, i.e. on roofs. The Planning Application even recognizes this by advising their intention to install attenuators and vibration mounts to dampen the noise. Residents of Betjeman Way will be exposed to this noise nuisance 24/7/365.

**Electrical Sub-Station** - The relevant work relates to the design, supply, and installation of an Electrical Substation within approximately 5m of the Gardens of Betjeman Way. The issue was raised at the meeting and all parties avoided giving accurate answers. We have now learnt from the application this is to be an electrical substation. It is fact; Sub-stations do make a noise. It is a consistent humming noise that these residents will be exposed to 24/7/365. Government legislation and environmental legislation has been developed specifically due to noise nuisance generated by sub stations.

**Plantroom** - The relevant work relates to the positioning of 3no Plantrooms to the Northwest of the school, closest to residents. Unfortunately, there is currently no detail what will be installed within the plantroom/s; however, we can assume plant will include, hot water service pumps, cold water service pumps, low temperature heating service pumps, pressurization equipment, filtration systems, Ground Source Heat Pumps, Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS) and Electrical Distribution. We can appreciate the plantrooms will have louvred doors however again noise will be generated, this is unavoidable in any building, hence why boiler houses are positioned intentionally away from residential dwellings.

**Ground Source Heat Network and Pumps** - The relevant work relates to the supply and installation of Ground Source Heat Network and the installation of Ground Source Heat Pumps (GSHP). We were advised specifically by the builder the heat network was to be installed away from residential housing to the West of the site under the MUGA

pitches and all pipework underground straight to the plantroom. This has now changed so that the heat network pipework will be installed in the lower field and pipework running adjacent to our boundaries to the GSHP. We must assume no noise or vibrations will be generated from the underground pipework. We were further advised of several different positions of the GSHP, from Southern Aspect to Northern Aspect, to even underground and most recently to the rear of the school (Planner email dated 31/10/23 refers). On receiving the plans these are now to be installed in the plantroom at the front of the school to the Northwest position (residential side). This just evidences again the conflicting information the residents have been told and advised of and the lack of thought that has gone into the design. It is accepted providing they are properly maintained, GSHP are quieter than Air Source Heat Pumps, however, will still generate an element of noise. Our concern is that coupled with all the other services to the Northern aspect of the school, these services will contribute to an overall noise issue for the residents.

Sump Pump - The relevant work relates to the supply and installation of a Sump Pump at the far East of the car park and adjacent 50 Betjeman Way. The sump pump being installed close to residential properties will cause an element of noise. Why is this not being installed on the school side?

Main Hall & Recreation Room - The relevant work relates to the positioning of the Main Hall & Recreation Room which will be used for Sports and School Events including Concerts and Disco's. It is also the school's intention for these facilities to be used by the community until 10pm in the evening all year round. The noise generated within the Gym would result in noise nuisance from balls bouncing, whistles, shouting and music. Residents will be exposed to the noise all year round. It is within 20m of the nearest resident's boundary and would subject many residents to unnecessary noise levels throughout the year.

Screening to All Weather Pitches (AWP) - The relevant works relate to the design, supply, and construction of the AWP and its use by the community in the summer months to sunset, at the latest circa 10pm. The noise generated from these pitches would result in noise nuisance from balls bouncing, whistles and shouting. We were advised by the Builder that an acoustic screen was to be installed on the Northern Fence facing the Betjeman Way properties. The plans now only show the acoustic screen to the West of the pitches facing the flats. Residents to the north of the pitches will be exposed to this noise nuisance throughout the year, outside of school hours and on weekends.

Deliveries - The relevant comment relates to delivery vehicles outside of school hours, Residents will be exposed to deliveries to the kitchens & the school outside of school hours. The turning head for all delivery vehicles within a few meters of the nearest boundary.

Waste Collection/Bin Store - The relevant comment relates to the positioning of the Bin Store, which will be closer than the current position. This again has given no consideration to the Residents, positioning the Bin Store in proximity of neighbouring properties. Waste

lorries will be required to collect waste and turn a few meters from the boundary of the nearest property.

Sole use of Drop offs - The relevant comment relates to the new car park being used for the sole purpose of pickup/drop offs. Whilst it has been communicated that the Southern access point will continue for this purpose, it is general knowledge the land and Laurette Academy 6th Form school has been sold and is pending development. When construction work commences, it is likely the use of this area for pick-ups & drop-offs will no longer be permitted, therefore making Clover Way entrance and car park the only pick-up/drop off point for the school and construction traffic. As well as Health and Safety concerns for pedestrians and students attending other schools, this will result in additional noise and pollution for the residents of Clover Way and Betjeman Way.

Overbearing overlook to the houses -The relevant document relates to the 3D imaging conducted by the planner in relation to the SEN room and adjacent windows overlooking 50 Betjeman Way which is an issue relating to Safeguarding of both the school children and residents children. Document SRP1148-1448882 refers to various guidelines which we believe have not been accurately followed and indeed the report fabricated in favour of the planning application and to rebut residents' general concerns.

In evidence the 3D images on page 22 clearly show an inaccuracy. Picture 1 shows a 3D image of the view from the SEN Resource Space looking over the flat roof to 50 Betjeman Way. Picture 2 a 3D image from the Small Group Room - Upper window, which is further away than the SEN Room and further away from 50 Betjeman Way. The distance and heights are inaccurate. You would expect the window from the room furthest away (Small Group Room) would be represented accordingly within these 3D images; however, this is not the case with this window appearing to be nearer to the property than the view from the actual closest window (SEN Resource Space). We do not believe these reports to be accurate and believe they have been fabricated to rebut the genuine concerns of residents.

Shadowing - The relevant document MB/RD/31693, Page 42 and by their own admission shadowing will occur "The only impact would result in mid-winter, where due to the height of the sun there may be a heightened level of overshadowing on the neighbouring properties at certain times of day. However, the period of time this would occur taking into consideration the rest of the year is minimal."

The planner further admits "The impact would not be significant during spring or summer months and in this regard, it is not considered to represent material harm to the neighbouring residents" Our Emphasis on the word significant. The report clearly would indicate the neighbouring properties would have shadowing; however, this is played down using the wording "not be significant." We would argue what the planners deem as "not significant" is irrelevant to the issue of shadowing and does not retract from the fact properties will suffer from overshadowing under the current proposal.



Right to Daylight (3D Modelling) - The relevant document relates to shadowing report Reference: SRP1148-NOV-XX-XX-T-A-PL01-DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT-PART\_2-1448882, page 17. Within this report the architect has carried out calculations based on BRE guidance 2022 "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - A Guide to Good Practice" which states: This guidance clearly states that if the distance of the new development is more than three times its height above the lowest window, the daylight is unlikely to be affected."

The architect has provided their calculations as follows:

The overall height of the proposed building  $9.557\text{m} \times 3 = 28.671\text{m}$

We must assume that the Architects calculations are correct, however given that the current distance from the existing school to 50 Betjeman Way is circa 20m, the calculations to the nearest properties (28.861m) must be taken with an element of trepidation as these calculations and distances are at the cusp of what is acceptable and if not accurate will affect the daylight to these properties as per BRE Guidance and will be challenged post construction.

Right to Daylight (20+ years) - The relevant comment relates to our right for daylight. As a homeowner for over 20 years, we have grave concerns over our right to daylight. We strongly believe these reports are inaccurate and developed to force the application through planning. It is our concern that if planning is approved and the development goes ahead our right to daylight will be taken away with no path for recovery.

Light Pollution from High Level Gym Windows - The relevant work relates to the installation of High-Level windows in the Gym. Outside of school hours the Gym is be used by the wider community. These high-level windows will produce light pollution outside of school hours and will affect properties to the Northern aspect until 10pm.

Kitchen Extract - The relevant comment relates to the positioning of the Kitchens in the school. It is a given any industrial kitchen will generate a level of noise and smell. The extracts are to be positioned to the Northern Aspect of the School towards the residents of Betjeman Way. The Architect and Builder have acknowledged there will be odours generated by the kitchens and to try and alleviate this have advised the extracts will be pointed away from neighbouring properties to the South. This will not resolve the smells. We are concerned we will not be able to open windows and doors during school terms without our homes and furnishings being overcome with school kitchen smells and odours.

Bin Store - The relevant comment relates to the positioning of the Bin Store, which will be closer than its current position. There has been no consideration to the Residents, positioning the Bin Store in proximity of boundaries. The smell generated from school bins will be within meters of existing properties gardens throughout the year. There is also a concern regarding the infestation of rodents into nearby gardens, sheds, and homes.

Welfare - The relevant comment relates to the Construction Phase Plan (CPP)SRP1148-TDC-XX-XX-T-X-003-ConstructionPhasePlan-P05-S 5 page 54, November 2023, which clearly shows the Welfare Units on the Boundary of 50/51 Betjeman Way. This is at odds with document MB/RD/31693 - NOVEMBER 2023, page 44.

The welfare cabins have been sighted with no consideration for the residents. The welfare units could easily be sighted to the South or East of the proposed development, which would not impact on the lives of the residents in the flats or Betjeman Way. Instead, the builder is sighting 2no double height welfare units, with windows overlooking into existing residential properties. No information on site storage or sub-contractor site cabins have been provided.

Construction Deliveries - The relevant comment relates to the Construction Phase Plan (CPP) and the site operating hours being 07:30 to 18:00 Monday to Friday. Government guidelines are from 08:00 to 18:00 and request these be adhered to.

Deliveries during school holidays are from 07:30 to 17:30. Deliveries to construction sites are of a noisy nature. We therefore request government guidelines of 08:00 to 18:00 be adhered to.

The CPP states "After 19.00 by arrangement - deliveries will not be noisy and will cause no disruption to local residents." This is inaccurate statement as the builder cannot predict whether a delivery will be noisy or not. Furthermore, they have already stated that site operating times will be 07:30 to 18:00. Again, the planning application has inaccuracies and conflicting information. Again, we request government guidelines of 08:00 to 18:00 be adhered to.

We do not accept any deliveries being made outside these hours and will make official complaints to the regulating authority if Government guidelines are not followed.

Hoarding - The relevant comment relates to the Construction Phase Plan (CPP). It is noted throughout the construction period hoarding will be used to enclose the construction site. "The recommended height for hoarding is 2.4m, although a height of at least 2m will be suitable for most building sites. However, for construction sites located in city centres or where children might attempt to gain access, high-security hoarding, or a high-security fence (both 3m) might be more suitable." Again, this was not raised at the meeting. Residents will not only be exposed to these construction works for the next 2 years but will also be exposed to 3m hoarding along our boundaries (emphasis on children gaining access) for a considerable period, with some residents looking at greater than two years if the works do not go to programme.

Construction Parking - The relevant comment relates to the Construction Phase Plan (CPP). It is noted in the CPP there is no onsite parking for Sub-Contractors and the Queensway Car Park is to be used. During the summer Months Gadebridge car parks are full of local Hemel Hempstead residents using the splash pool and park facilities, we are concerned these construction works will cause an

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>overspill onto Gadebridge Lane causing dangerous parking.</p> <p>Clover Way - The relevant comment relates to the issue of parking and the restricted parking which will be imposed on the residents of Clover Way and residents of the flats. It must be noted, considering the Builders have put in a request to have double yellow lines on either side of the road on Clover Way, none of the residents were invited to the consultation.</p> <p>Clover Way and the surrounding area already have a parking issue. Restricting further parking of the residents will put more cars parking on Gadebridge Road which will be additional danger to the 100's of school children that walk to school and attend Gade Valley and Laurette Academy.</p> <p>Dust - The relevant comment relates to the dust that will be created during construction and demolition. Whilst we accept dust will be generated during construction this will be minimal compared to when the demolition works commence. To allow residents of Betjeman way to still be able to open windows, doors and use their gardens during the summer months, we request consideration for all demolition works be carried out in the winter months.</p> <p>Social Value - St Cuthbert Mayne Catholic Junior School is not a community school with many of their students residing outside the area. Many Children in the local area do not have access to this school or its facilities with most of the children who attend the school being driven from further afield. This adds additional congestion to the already heavily congested Gadebridge Road. As this is not a community school, it therefore raises the question under the banner of "Social Value" what commitments have been made for the "community of Gadebridge.</p> |
| <p>38 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>Generally the re-development of the original school should be welcomed, as it will benefit the children that attend and the community as a whole. It would seem a shame that more extensive consultation and/or explanation has not been entered into to facilitate this in a manner that more fully engaged the adjacent properties.</p> <p>Developer's comment:</p> <p>"It should also be noted that the proposed building has been placed at the same distance from the northern boundary as the existing building."</p> <p>The building at it's planned point, is significantly closer to more of the properties than the existing building is. The measured distance to numbers 41 and 38 Betjeman Way is 28861 and 28961 with a building height of 9.557m. The 3 times distance to height rule for light is being met by 28cm and as the land slopes down from the existing level of the proposed sight, if this drop is added to the height of the building then would it fail that rule. Also as there is the large preserved tree the difference in levels and the position of the new building has an amplified effect on the light enjoyed by number 40.</p> <p>Developer's comment:</p>  |

For the 25 degree rule a "conservative approach" has been taken, and the height of a typical cill height of a domestic window has been taken.

A casual observation of the adjacent elevation of the property, and indeed the drawings themselves show that the windows in question are those of a conservatory. The cill is therefore significantly lower than the assumption in the planning documents and call into question the validity of the calculations used. The document also references the tree in the garden of 38 in it's validation of the sight line/privacy justifications. It should be noted that this is factually incorrect and if simple details are erroneous, then what other elements of the 70 plus documents are incorrect, given that residents have been given a limited time to examine them over a period where it has been difficult to get professional input to verify the complex and technical information contained within, due to the extended Christmas period.

Developer's comment:

During the public consultation event, some residents of the properties adjacent to the northern boundary expressed concerns regarding how the quantity and quality of daylight would be effected due to the location of the new building and the new trees proposed along this boundary.

In order to address these concerns, the landscape architects have revisited the proposal and consequentially re-distributed the proposed trees across the site, minimising the number of trees on the northern boundary. These trees have also been located further away from the boundary. Species will also be specified to keep canopy spread to a minimum.

This does not address concerns over how the new building affects the quality of light. The trees initially were positioned as screening between the school and the adjacent properties along its northern boundary. This did not take into account that the properties gardens are south facing and as such these trees would shadow the gardens completely and all year round. It is not surprising that these have been re-distributed as that was a significant detriment to the adjoining properties and showed a lack of awareness or consideration of the effects of the development on local residents. They haven't all been redistributed in a way that eliminates this shading however, so there will still be some effect on the enjoyment of properties.

The shadow diagrams in document SRP1148-NOV-XX-XX-T-A-PL01DESIGN\_AND\_ACCESS\_STATEMENT-PART\_2-1448882 show inconsistencies. For example the Existing 22-12 9am diagram shows the garden of 37 and 38 Betjeman Way in shadow from trees to the rear. The proposed diagram shows these as unshaded by the same trees. How can this be and is the other data accurate? There has been no time for residents to have another survey carried out. The latter diagram also shows significant additional shading which will have an impact on properties and especially the light of number 40 Betjeman Way.

The design of the building has placed the facilities that are likely to generate most noise and disturbance to residents in the areas adjacent to the surrounding properties. In contrast the library for example is

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>placed at the southern end of the building. The MUGA is positioned directly adjacent to the properties on the West and North boundaries and the Sports Hall, Activity Hall, Kitchen, plant rooms, refuse storage, substation are all positioned on the residential North side. The later areas could also cause light pollution to the properties adjacent to the North boundary dependant on the positioning of the internal and external lighting. The current building frequently causes light pollution as floodlights are routinely left on during night hours to the south elevation.</p> <p>Currently when events are held at the school these are audible to the surrounding properties. If as would be hoped these facilities are used more by the local wider community then this will cause more frequent disturbance from a closer facility. The Kitchen, plant rooms and substation appear to have mitigations in place to minimise noise, but for quiet enjoyment any consistent background noise can become intrusive and as such would be minimised if at least some of the components could be located in an appropriate position away from the residential boundaries. Air handling units for example are placed on the kitchen roof, the wording in the report on the plant room is that external emissions (of noise) from (the heating system are) expected to be minimal. Has the cumulative effect of these been adequately assessed in the expected ambient noise of 41dB as this is significant in terms of background noise and at about 80% of the limit?</p> <p>The parking arrangements for the residents in Clover Way during the construction works are inadequate and the lack of thought or planning to minimise disruption to them seems typical of the concern shown to surrounding residents. Traffic on Gadebridge Road is difficult currently at busy times. Add in additional vehicles parked by displaced residents and additional construction workers and this situation will be made worse. Cars already use the pavements for parking, sometimes making it difficult for disabled users and parents using pushchairs.</p> <p>The Public Consultation held, whilst being an open event, was not a full consultation. Not all residents were invited, the ward councillors were not invited and from discussions with other residents the information provided verbally was not consistent and some of it would appear to have been erroneous. Comments made seem to have been used to tailor the planning application. An earlier series of consultations over the period that this has evolved, would have enabled residents to be kept informed and allowed ideas to be exchanged</p> |
| <p>7 Clover Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3EA</p> | <p>It is completely unreasonable to remove the already inadequate parking on Clover Way. By enforcing double yellow lines on the road there will only be 4 car spaces. For a road with 5 houses and 16 flats this is simply a ridiculous suggestion. There is no alternate parking available due to the close proximity to schools which would either cause residents to park unsafely, or have to park extremely far away. As a resident with elderly parents with medical needs and a very young granddaughter this would be very impractical and cause multiple issues.</p> <p>I am becoming very distressed by the thought of my life being completely upturned for 2 years when no thought has been put in place</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>to remedy the issues its causing. If I had the funds to change my front garden into a drive way I would as this would also help with the anxiety this is causing me.</p>  |
| <p>12 Gilders<br/>Sawbridgeworth<br/>Sawbridgeworth<br/>CM21 0EF</p>     | <p>This development is suitable for the inclusion of integrated Swift bricks within the fabric of the new building.</p> <p>The present proposals for bird and bat boxes are of limited benefit. The proposed boxes to be attached to the building are external rather than integrated. There are a number of problems with external boxes, including that they can be removed or become dislodged. The prospect of a bird box falling off the wall and hitting a child would probably be considered unacceptable.</p> <p>Integrated boxes on the other hand require no maintenance and carry none of these risks, and in addition last the lifetime of the building.</p> <p>The proposed boxes will also only benefit a limited number of species. Swift bricks conform to the British Standard for integrated nest boxes, BS42021:2022 and in doing so provide nest cavities for a number of birds including four red-listed species of conservation concern: Swift, House Martin, House Sparrow and Starling, all of which nest in Hemel Hempstead</p> <p>Swifts in particular nest close to this site on Glenview Road and Long Chaulden, as recorded on the RSPB's Swift Mapper website, <a href="http://www.Swiftmapper.org.uk">www.Swiftmapper.org.uk</a></p> <p>The study of birds nesting in Swift bricks could also be a beneficial school project for the children. Provision for Swifts has been required in other Hertfordshire schools including Watford Girls Grammar School and Mandeville Primary in Sawbridgeworth.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the scale of the development, please consider securing Swift bricks by way of a condition, worded such as "no development shall take place until written details are approved by the LPA of the model and location of 6 integrated Swift bricks, to be fully installed prior to occupation and retained thereafter" in accordance with the NPPF.</p> |
| <p>47 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed construction of a school adjacent to our residential properties. Whilst I understand the importance of educational institutions and appreciate the efforts to provide better facilities for our children, I believe the chosen location could have significant drawbacks for the residents.</p> <p>Firstly, This was not a Public Consultation. This was a targeted approach to specific residents to garner information for the sole use by the planner to produce reports to rebut those concerns prior to submitting the planning application. Those who did attend were told conflicting information and lied to regarding specific concerns raised.</p> <p>Secondly, the tranquillity of our neighbourhood will be disrupted. Building works, by their very nature, generate a considerable amount of noise. This project is to last at least two years with constant noise generated by the initial building and then demolition of the old school.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Add to this the construction traffic during drop-off and pick-up times will significantly impact the peaceful environment we currently enjoy. We therefore request government guidelines of 08:00 to 18:00 be adhered to.</p> <p>Thirdly, the issue of privacy comes into play. With the school being next to our back gardens, there is a potential risk of intrusion into our private spaces. Our homes are places where we should feel secure and unobserved. Having a school in such close proximity will compromise this.</p> <p>Lastly, my current 'Outlook' from my bedroom window is of a school playing field and Gadebridge park beyond. This is to be replaced with a School Building, Welfare Units, Extraneous Utility buildings and a bin store. These facilities should be relocated away from any residential areas as they will cause overshadowing to the properties in Betjeman Way. The solution to this would have been to reconsider the orientation of the building, turning the building 180 degrees on the new footprint with all the noisy, foul, and intrusive services to the Southern aspect where the only neighbouring properties would be that of another educational facility.</p> <p>In conclusion, while I fully support the provision of quality education and understand the need for new and improved schools, I believe that the proposed location next to our back gardens is not suitable. I kindly request that these concerns be taken into consideration when deciding on the location of the new school. Thank you for your understanding.</p>   |
| <p>47 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>Firstly, I would like it acknowledged by the Committee, that when our estate was built, Betjeman Way, it was designed to ensure the privacy of residents where neighbours do not overlook directly into gardens; (privacy is something that in many plans isn't always dealt with so sympathetically). This attention to detail was thought through, with equal consideration for the school. We do not overlook the school buildings and we have lived in harmony for decades.</p> <p>I live at No 47 Betjeman Way. My objections to the rebuilding of St Cuthbert Mayne, Clover Way, Hemel Hempstead cover several issues. My neighbours are affected even more as they live on the south facing (North) boundary, but my objections are no less relevant despite my location. I have no objection if the school needs to be replaced, but I have every objection that it is to be positioned where it will be overbearing, and we will all be affected by noise and light pollution and two years of building immediately adjacent to our boundary. Being gawped at by builders on cranes and ladders.</p> <p>The flyer we received, showed a ghostly impression of the houses surrounding the new building, indicative of how little we have been taken into consideration. Whether this be regarding noise pollution, light pollution, privacy, loss of light, we have not been given due respect as neighbours; and why were so few informed of the meeting, many only found out by word of mouth, including local councillors.</p> <p>The meeting held at the school, was simply playing lip service. We were invited to write comments on hastily printed forms, forms that</p> |

were likely discarded unread. It was an opportunity for the team to go through the motions of what they called a 'Consultation'.

It is with privacy in mind, that I question the location of the replacement school building. When I had sight of the leaflet prepared by the planning team, my immediate reaction was 'why have they placed the building so terribly close to the (our) South Facing boundary'? This building is going to affect the privacy of both residents and children.

Noise and Light pollution. Ground Source Heat Pumps, Extraction from Catering facilities, sub-station, security lighting, CCTV and other equipment and machinery vital to heating and lighting the school make the proximity of all these facilities, to Betjeman Way neighbours, even more alarming. When the planning team were questioned at the meeting, residents were assured that there would be little or no impact from any of the above, but this simply is not true. To be patronised in this way is an insult to our intelligence.

Before the meeting the leaflet posted through the door lacked any significant detail and is merely a graphic with no specific measurements nor labelling that was immediately apparent, Ground Source Heat Pumps for example. We have now been given just 14 days to digest the minutiae of 78 documents surrounding these issues. Those delivering the plan to the neighbours have no possible idea how we will be affected.

The building unquestionably is out of keeping and overbearing. The design, a bland unprepossessing box that will loom above the South Facing (north) boundary of neighbours and in the depths of winter a shadow nearly 3 times the height of the building will be cast across the boundary. To simply walk round for 20 minutes take a few bearings and guesstimate the sun/shadow and totally dismiss the presence of several houses is demonstrative of how hastily this whole plan has been flung together.

My very first question to one of the planning team upon viewing the rather inadequate model was 'why can it not be turned by 90 degrees to face North/South then built on the North Facing Boundary that lies parallel with the land occupied by Gade Valley and a dilapidated Laureate Sixth Form Academy Building'?

My question was dismissed with the rather flimsy reasoning that 'there is a slope'. Well of course there is a slope we live on a hill on the edge of the Chilterns. To simply place the building in the proposed position, a flat area currently used for recreation, demonstrates the total and utter lack of ingenuity and imagination, there is no consideration for the impact the building will have on those living on Betjeman Ways boundary.

The planning team expressed concern for trees on the South Boundary, which would have to be felled if the building were moved there, yet trees will be felled etc to accommodate the 'landscaping'. To use the trees as a reason to not build on the opposite boundary is a very weak argument.



The submission is dated 04.12.23, we only had knowledge of it on 14/12/23. We had just 14 days, to respond and 78 very technical documents to wade through

during the last two weeks of December, covering the whole of the Christmas period (two weekends and two bank holidays) where respondents will be preoccupied with family and holidays. Disingenuous!!!!

When this was challenged, we were advised that 'Government' places high importance on the provision of new public service infrastructure and there is a 10 week time limit, so why was the plan not submitted in November as promised, giving residents more time to respond. Yet more delaying tactics. Noted!!!!

It has not gone unnoticed that past applications for the school were under the title 'St Cuthbert Mayne', this application has been submitted under the name 'Blessed Cuthbert Mayne', another tactic used to shroud the plan and mislead those who might have reason to complain.

All this brings into question whether this 'consultation' meets Gunning's Principles. There is a very deep feeling that the whole process and has been hasty, resulting in so many issues that need to be addressed which surely makes it impossible to proceed with the build within the timeframe suggested until a full formal and all-encompassing consultation has been conducted with Gadebridge residents.

The proximity of the actual building has caused so many issues to come to light, as I have explained above. But for every problem there is a solution. So, were the position of the building to be reconsidered, the issues that I, and many of my neighbours are raising, will be negated. Noise pollution, light pollution, loss of privacy, loss of light, shadow casting.

Attempts at placating us with the inclusion of landscaping as part of the submission demonstrates that the team knew the building needs to be disguised and its impact reduced to pacify the neighbours. Planting trees on our boundary would FURTHER cause loss of light in winter, till now WE HAVE NOT BEEN OVERLOOKED. We all guard our privacy as is our right. This will be lost forever.

There is absolutely no guarantee that the school will have the necessary funding to maintain these trees, which has been an issue for residents of Betjeman Way. Some have paid to have trees, on school grounds, tended to after they became a nuisance casting shadow across gardens, and were unsafe due to neglect. Please do not underestimate the issues that long shadows cause for those with gardens. There are mental health issues that are not admissible in an objection but they exist.

We have no right to a 'view nor a vista', but Outlook is relevant for the residents. Quote: Loss of outlook occurs where development would have an adverse overbearing effect that would result in an unduly oppressive living environment for existing and future residents.'

I and many of my neighbours will feel like prisoners, hemmed in by a

building that is completely out of keeping with the area. THIS has not been addressed by either the design or planning team. Such a building should not be thrust upon its neighbours without proper consultation. The design and aesthetic of a replacement school building should be in keeping and reflect its situation, which is one of outstanding beauty in a town that has been ravaged in the past by modernisation.

The solution, is to locate the building, where the Ground Source Heat Pump(s), Sub stations (s), extraction from kitchens, security lighting, CCTV, overshadowing, privacy! are acceptable to ALL! A location where the school can avoid an inevitable and constant barrage of complaints about ambient noise during the night, and cooking smells drifting through our windows during the day, loss of privacy and noise from the late-night sports activities etc.

Look at the façade and materials used to construct it, bland, unprepossessing and unlikely to pass the test of time, there has been absolutely no attempt to design this building to complement its surroundings.

This is NOT an inner-city school. The architects haven't read the lie of the land nor its surroundings. For those who will be unable to avoid its impact, the design is incredibly important, as important as its proximity. The committee would not be doing their duty if they did not consider the impact on the lives of everyone involved having to stare through their window at THAT!!!! The current building is NOT falling down so why rush into this and get it wrong, where with a little more adherence to Gunnings Principles, it could be SO RIGHT!!!!

There are two boundaries. Building on one will have an overwhelming effect on the lives of the residents of Betjeman Way, the other will negate any risk of the affects of Ground Source Heat Pumps etc etc etc on those residents. Apart from the inconvenience of portable classrooms, what other reason might be given for simply placing the new building on the current footprint. Is this an option that has been explored then rejected? This is not without precedent as another school in Hemel is undergoing a rebuild with the use of portable classrooms.

Is the inclusion of the MUGA for the children or it is simply a money raising exercise. The school is an institution for Learning and Worship, and NOT a public sports facility. The MUGA will further impact its neighbours, none of whose children attend the school. There are perfectly good sports facilities at the Leisure Centre, a 5-minute drive away. The inclusion of sound retaining fence can only mean one thing, that it is in the wrong location. Is this purely a vanity project included by the architects to give their plans more appeal. The children will effectively be hemmed into a sports pen.

The design through-out has either used trees as camouflage and metal fences as sound proofing, this demonstrates that the architects are trying to solve issues of their own making. They are absolutely aware that this whole plan is flawed, but having undergone pre-emptive consultation with the council planners, they are confident that this is in the bag. But I and many of my very distressed neighbours beg to differ.

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>The impact goes further, children who use the alleyway from Gadebridge Road to walk to; Gade Valley, Laureate Academy, Collett School and Heme Hempstead schools, will now be seriously affected by works traffic on Clover Way. Residents [here] will have all parking suspended to enable works traffic access. Some residents are elderly and infirm. None of those living on Clover Way has been formally 'consulted'. WHY!!!!</p> <p>The location of welfare buildings has left my neighbours utterly bewildered and outraged. Yet MORE noise, light pollution, loss of privacy. The very real threat of smells from catering and vermin. This must be relocated and hours of 'business' to strictly follow Government guidelines.</p> <p>*We have not been given the courtesy of a 'Public consultation' because the public were not invited to a consultation. Only a handful of cherry-picked neighbours had knowledge of a 'meeting' at the school.</p> <p>*The 'consultation period' has been severely curtailed.</p> <p>*There has not been a free flow of information between planners and residents.</p> <p>*Concerns about Privacy, Noise Pollution, Light Pollution, equipment have been treated with derision.</p> <p>*Information forthcoming has been vague and generic</p> |
| <p>55 Longman Court<br/>Stationers Place<br/>Apsley Hemel<br/>Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP3 9RS</p> | <p>The school is in desperate need of redevelopment and the proposed plans are the best thing for the school and the pupils.</p> <p>We need to focus on children's education and enabling them all to have equal opportunities for learning and growth. However there are currently two levels to the school with no lift or wheelchair access thus restricting those unable to use stairs from being able to access the entire school. The new plans would also provide the children with better facilities for physical exercise which is of great importance for their health and wellbeing. Additionally, access to the car park by the main entrance is poor, especially for larger vehicles and particularly emergency service vehicles and the new plans would enable easier access for all vehicles.</p>   |
| <p>Allendene<br/>Roughdown Villas Road,<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP3 0AX</p>             | <p>The school is in major need of redevelopment, having been largely undeveloped since its construction. The construct of the building, in particular the metal framed, single pain windows are extremely energy inefficient and there are other significant areas that require attention which would not exist in a modern school building built to today's standards. Refurbishment of the existing building would not represent value for money and would cause significant disruption to pupils. The build of a new school building adjacent to the existing building poses the best outcome for pupils, to ensure limited disruption and provide a building that is fit for purpose for future generations. Whilst there will be some disruption from construction, I believe the planned development of the site has been sympathetic to potential concerns from local residents. School pick-up and drop-off will continue to take place</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>through the shared car park between the school and Gade Valley, so this will pose no traffic increase to the current situation during peak times. Furthermore, the multi-use games area will benefit the local community by providing improved facilities for community sports and clubs.</p>  |
| <p>40 Tile Kiln Crescent<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP3 8NT</p> | <p>I fully support this application.</p>  |
| <p>16 Barnard Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP3 9EX</p>        | <p>While I appreciate the concerns of the local residents, the school is in desperate need of redevelopment, and in order to maintain a consistent education for the children, the proposed development as it stands is the best means of doing so. The school has to continue throughout the redevelopment, and to do so, the new building has to be built away from the old one. To build it further down the hill would only cause more disruption and a greater level of construction traffic. The education of children should be a priority, and the minimal sound of some heat pumps really isn't going to make that much difference to local residents.</p> <p>Similarly, the proposed parking hadn't actually changed, as the school drop off is going to remain in the current shared car park as explained at the consultation. In relation to the MUGA, this is a brilliant facility that will benefit the local community as well as the school, providing increased sporting opportunities for children throughout Hemel.</p> |
| <p>7 Typleden Close<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP2 5YL</p>      | <p>Development would be great for the current outdated school premises, this would create new and needed learning and experiences for the children.</p> <p>The new parking and drop off zone proposed would ease the very high traffic/parking areas between the three schools situated in the area.</p>  |
| <p>38 Green End Road<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 1QR</p>     | <p>Given the general state and limitations of the current building I believe that a new build is the best way forward.</p> <p>The new design will provide a modern environment tailored to the function of providing high quality primary education. The plans will improve access and safeguarding. The environmental impact of the new build appears to have been thoroughly considered and minimised. The new school will provide an enhanced facility to the benefit of the community as a whole. I believe that the concerns of local residents and been heard and accommodated where possible.</p> <p>In my opinion this proposal will benefit the school and its current and future pupils, and deliver a clear net benefit to the wider community.</p>  |
| <p>40 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p>       | <p>I have 2 objections concerning the effects of this development on my home. These are described below and referenced to the Dacorum Strategic Design Guide, Part 2 Dacorum Design Principles (DDP), Feb 2021, and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>In Particular:</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>6.4 Maximise Space and Daylight<br/>6.6 Discreet Waste Storage<br/>5.12 Ensure servicing is discreet</p> <p>The DDP, which applies to all scales and types of developments, includes the principle of 'Comply or Justify'. This states that deviation from the principles may only be permitted with robust and evidence-based justification for doing so. This proposed development includes deviations but no stated justifications.</p> <p>Furthermore, the design of this development does not take opportunities available to improve the character and quality of the area, as set out in in Para 130 of NPPF. It detracts from it as it affects my home and other homes bordering the site in Betjeman Way.</p> <p>Objection 1 - Loss of light</p> <p>My home is situated approximately 52 metres from the proposed new school building and on a lower level than the existing MUGA. The outlook from my rear garden and ground floor rooms looks south between neighbouring homes 38 and 41 Betjeman Way, and over the site of the proposed new building. This limited opening of approximate 7 metres in width and beneath a large, protected tree is a key source of daylight to the rear of my home. It is of particular importance as access to daylight is already restricted by the protected tree.</p> <p>The new main school building will occupy a significant proportion of this important light source. I believe this is contrary to Design Aim 6.4 of DDP.</p> <p>Objection 2 - Noise Disturbance</p> <p>The proximity of the bin storage area, plant room and kitchen ventilation equipment to the rear of my home are likely to bring anti-social noises that are not currently present. This is referred to by the applicant in the planning application. Waste bins being filled, moved and emptied by large noisy bin lorries frequently throughout the school day and, potentially, at other times out of school hours. The heating and ventilation equipment will emit noise when operating and this may be during the night. I believe the siting of these waste bins and machinery close to mine and other Betjeman Way homes is contrary to Design Aims 6.6 and 5.12 of DPP.</p> <p>My objections could be overcome by alternative placement of the main school building and locating its services on its southern side of the site, away from Betjeman Way homes and neighbouring no others.</p> |
| <p>43 Betjeman Way<br/>Hemel Hempstead<br/>Hertfordshire<br/>HP1 3HJ</p> | <p>I accept that a new school is needed but the plans do not make any consideration of the surrounding properties, i.e. Betjeman Way.</p> <p>My home is directly behind numbers 41 and 42 who border the school. I understand from neighbours the once the new school has been erected, it will cast shadow across my south facing garden, thus losing the sunlight which we have enjoyed for the past 30 years.</p> <p>In addition the relevant plant, heating and ventilation of the new building will be much nearer to my home. The thought of humming, rumbling and smells from these items is horrific.</p> <p>I did not receive any notification from the school of the so called public</p>   |

consultation and therefore feel that the "consultation" was not widespread enough to count as a true consultation.

To sum up:

1. Consultation inadequate
2. Why are the plants, heat source, kitchens etc designed on our side of the plot affecting residents when it would be just as easy to put such items on the opposite side facing open ground?
3. Why is the new building placed so much nearer to Betjeman Way homes?
4. Lack of privacy
5. Lack of light to our homes which in my case I have had for over 30 years.
6. Where is the consideration shown in these plans towards neighbours and their privacy.

I implore you to reject the current plans until they redesign with plant, heat pumps etc are on the other side of the building and/or move the building further away from Betjeman Way.