

**ITEM NUMBER: 5c**

<b>24/01755/FUL</b>	<b>Demolition of 43 garages and the construction of 8 residential units, car parking and associated landscaping.</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>Land at Chenies Court</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>	<b>Four Daughters Estate Ltd</b>	<b>Bell Cornwall LLP</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Robert Freeman</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	<b>Hemel Hempstead</b>	<b>Woodhall Farm</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>This application has been referred to the Development Management Committee at the request of Councillor Wyatt-Lowe. Councillor Wyatt-Lowe is aware of public interest in the scheme and is concerned regards over development of the site and a lack of car parking.</b>	

1. **RECOMMENDATION** – That planning permission be **DELEGATED** with a **VIEW TO APPROVAL** subject to the completion of a planning obligation securing mitigation measures under the Chiltern Beechwoods Mitigation Strategy.

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 The application has fully addressed the reasons for refusal of planning application 22/00897/FUL and appeal decision APP/A1910/W/22/3313055

2.2 The construction of new dwellings is acceptable in this location in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Core Strategy.

2.3 The proposals are acceptable in terms of their design, bulk, scale, height, use of materials and appearance and would not detract from the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

2.4 There would be no displacement of vehicles resulting from the demolition of the substandard and small garages whilst the provision of parking in excess of the required standards under Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020) should provide additional parking for local residents helping to alleviate parking stress in the locality.

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

3.1 The application comprises three former garage courts associated with the occupation of flats at Chenies Court and Datchet Close, Woodhall Farm. These sites comprises some 43 garages which are stated to be vacant and are in a poor state of repair. Chenies Court comprises a mix of two storey detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and three storey flats. A number of wide amenity greens with tall trees provide an attractive and verdant setting to the existing flats.

**4.0 PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 The current application is a resubmission following the refusal of planning application 22/00897/FUL and its subsequent appeal (APP/A1910/W/22/3313055)

4.2 This application was refused on the 25<sup>th</sup> July 2022 for the following reasons:

1) The proposed development, in view of it design, layout, site coverage, scale and height would not result in a high quality design and would result in an incongruous residential

scheme harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area and contrary to paragraphs 126-136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (NPPF), Policies CS8, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.

2) The proposed development (Block B) is considered to result in harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties by reason of a loss of privacy, an overbearing impact and visual intrusion contrary to Policies CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.

3) The proposed development (Block A) is considered to have a poor relationship with significant trees to Arkley Road and Datchet Close which over time is likely to result in a significant demand for pruning and maintenance works. Such works would be detrimental to the long term health and amenity value of these trees contrary to Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.

4) The proposed development would result in the removal of a number of garages at the application site, the occupancy rate of which has not been provided. Although sufficient off-street parking is provided for the proposed number of dwellings, this is inconveniently located for occupants of these dwellings and does not appear to facilitate safe, convenient and accessible parking in accordance with Policies C8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020). It has not been demonstrated that any displacement of parking from the garages or parking by future occupants on the highway adjacent to property would not contribute to undue parking stress in the locality nor that it would not ultimately be detrimental to highways safety. For these reasons the proposals are also contrary to Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 51, 54 and 58 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

5) The application does not provide sufficient information to satisfy the council, as competent authority, that the proposed development will not adversely affect the integrity of the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area for Conservation and there are no alternative solutions/mitigation or credible imperative reasons of overriding public interest why the proposed development should be permitted. In the absence of such information, and in the absence of an appropriate legal agreement to mitigate such adverse impact, the proposed development is contrary to policy CS26, paragraph 175 of the NPPF (2021), and the requirements of the Habitats Regulations 2017 and 2019.

4.3 The Planning Inspectorate dismissed the appeal on the 14<sup>th</sup> November 2023 concluding that:

- “The convoluted building design including projecting elements and hipped roofs would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development...the scheme would read as a visually intrusive and incongruous form of development”
- “ the appeal development would not be harmful to the wellbeing of the trees and thus, their contribution to local character would be unaffected”
- “whilst overlooking could be adequately mitigated, the appeal proposals would nevertheless have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the existing occupiers of Nos 32-37 and with particular regards to outlook” and

- "the proposed development would not adversely affect highways safety with particular regard to parking displacement and the safety, convenience and accessibility of the proposed parking"

4.4 A draft legal agreement in respect of SAMM and SANG was not considered further by the Inspectorate given the harm identified in paragraph 4.3 above.

## **5.0 PROPOSALS**

5.1 The proposals still seek to demolish 43 garages across three sites at Chenies Court and construct 8 flats including 6 x 1 bed units and 2 x 2 bed properties.

5.2 Site 1, located between Chenies Court and Arkley Road would see the demolition of the garages and the setting out of 12 parking spaces. These spaces would be unallocated and accessed from Arkley Road to the west as per the existing garage court. The car parking area on site 1 have been reduced by a single space since the dismissed appeal.

5.3 On site 2, located at the junction of Arkley Road and Datchet Close, a three storey building would be constructed providing 6 x 1 bed flats together with bin and cycle storage and a modest shared amenity space. The front elevation would be orientated to the east with access to the building being taken from Chenies Court.

5.4 On site 3, to the south east of Chenies Court, it is proposed to construct a two storey building containing 2 x 2 bed units together with bin storage and outdoor amenity space. These properties would have individual access points on the western and southern elevations.

5.5 The scheme dismissed at appeal contained two sets of 4 x 1 bed units on sites 2 and 3.

## **6. REPRESENTATIONS**

### Consultation responses

6.1 These are reproduced at Appendix A.

### Neighbour Responses

6.2 These are reproduced at Appendix B

## **7. PLANNING POLICIES**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 – Towns and Large Villages

CS8 – Sustainable Transport

CS9 – Management of Roads

CS10 – Quality of Settlement Design

CS11- Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS17 – New Housing

CS18 – Mix of Housing

CS25 – Landscape Character  
CS26 – Green Infrastructure  
CS29 – Sustainable Design and Construction  
CS31 - Water Management  
CS32 - Air, Soil and Water Quality  
Hemel Hempstead Place Strategy  
CS35 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

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

Policy 13 - Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations  
Policy 18 – The Size of New Dwellings  
Policy 21 – Density of Residential Development  
Policy 51 – Development and Transport Impacts  
Policy 54 – Highway Design  
Policy 99 – Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands  
Appendix 3 – Layout and Design of Residential Areas.

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Area Based Policies for Hemel Hempstead – Character Area HCA33: Woodhall Farm  
Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)  
Energy Efficiency and Conservation (2005)  
Hertfordshire County Council - Place and Movement Planning Design Guide  
Strategic Sites Design Guide (2021)  
Water Conservation (2005)

## **8. CONSIDERATIONS**

### Policy and Principle

- 8.1 The site is located within a residential area of Hemel Hempstead where there would be no objection in principle to the construction of new residential units in accordance with Policies CS1, CS2 and CS4 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.2 The provision of appropriate residential development would support the delivery of new homes in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.3 The application site is subject to an appeal decision supporting residential use that should be given significant weight in any planning decision. The areas of concern for the Inspector were the design of the proposals and their impact on the character and appearance of the area and the impact on the outlook for neighbouring flats. These matters have been addressed in this application.

### Layout and Design

- 8.4 The application has been referred to committee given concerns regarding the overdevelopment of these sites given the inadequacy of parking.
- 8.5 The proposed buildings cover less of the application site than the previous proposals for the development of the site. The development on site 2 covers a similar footprint to the existing garages with surrounding space being used for landscaping. The absence of a designated amenity space for these properties is not considered overly harmful given the proximity to public open space and overall character and appearance of the area.

- 8.6 An external amenity space commensurate with the footprint of the development would be provided to Site 3 in accordance with Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.
- 8.7 It is evident from the Inspectors report on the previous proposals that the proposed residential buildings have an appropriate layout, site coverage and amenity provision in accordance with Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.
- 8.8 The amendments undertaken in this application have resulted in a far simpler design and appearance to the proposed units and one matching the appearance of adjacent blocks of flats. The hipped roofs, subject to criticism by the Inspectorate, have been removed in favour of gable roof forms. The windows and other openings have been altered to reflect the proportion of windows in neighbouring properties and matching materials and details are now proposed.
- 8.9 The overall appearance of the properties is now considered to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of Chenies Court and would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed buildings are now considered to be appropriate in terms of their scale and appearance and as such there can be no objections under Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

#### Residential Amenity

- 8.10 The dwellings provided as a result of this development would be constructed to meet the National Minimum Space Standards<sup>1</sup> and are considered to provide a good level of accommodation for future occupants in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy. All habitable rooms have at least one clear glazed fully opening window providing natural light, outlook and ventilation. An absence of private external amenity space is not considered to be significantly harmful to the amenity of future occupants, as per the Inspectorates judgement and given the short walk to areas of public open spaces.

#### Impact on Neighbouring Properties

- 8.11 The other outstanding issue from the planning appeal decision was the impact of the proposed development upon the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. In particular, the Inspector was concerned with the relationship between the building on Plot 3 and the adjacent flats at 26-37 Chalfont Close to the south of this site.
- 8.12 The building on Plot 2 is not considered harmful to the amenity of residential units adjacent thereto given its juxtaposition and clearance of 45 degree angles to neighbouring windows. It would not overlook neighbouring properties to the detriment of their amenity nor, would there be any significant impact on either daylight or sunlight. A bin store to 34-42 Chenies Court will be replaced as part of this residential scheme and expanded to accommodate refuse from the development of this plot.
- 8.13 The building on Plot 3 has been scaled back with a reduction in its depth, width and height. A double gable has been introduced to the flank elevation and changes to the materials and fenestration has been utilised to break up its mass. The building would be located further away (15m) from the flats at 26-37 Chalfont Close so as to alleviate any potential overbearing impact and to improve their outlook. The windows in the flank elevation would be fitted with high level openings and obscured glazed in the interest of privacy.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Minimum Space Standards are 1b1p – 39m<sup>2</sup>, 1b2p – 50m<sup>2</sup> and 2b3p – 61m<sup>2</sup>

- 8.14 There would now be a gap of some 15m between the flank elevation of the proposed building to Plot 3 and the facing elevation at 26-37 Chalfont Close. There would be no significant impact in daylight or sunlight to 26-37 Chalfont Close as the proposed development would not breach a 25 degree angle to windows to the Chalfont Close properties. Despite the change in topography, the building would not be considered overbearing to the occupants of these units.
- 8.15 The proposed building would not project significantly to the rear of the neighbouring building nor breach a 45 degree angle to the windows in its eastern elevation.
- 8.16 The resulting development has overcome the reasons for refusal in previous submissions and would not cause harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring buildings in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

#### Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

- 8.17 The Councils reason for refusal on highway safety and parking grounds was not upheld by the Inspectorate and as such it is not considered that a refusal on highway grounds could be substantiated. The Inspector opined that the evidence was not persuasive that the proposals would exacerbate parking stress and congestion in the area.
- 8.18 A total of 10.5 spaces are required under the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)<sup>2</sup>. Despite the reduction in the number of parking spaces associated with the development from 13 to 12 spaces, the overall parking level would exceed that required under the SPD. The dimensions of the parking spaces has been amended to be in accordance with those set out in Hertfordshire County Council - Place and Movement Planning Design Guide and as such there would be no objections to either the layout or number of off-street spaces to serve the scheme under Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.19 In considering the previous planning application, the Inspector concluded that displacement parking from the existing garages was likely to be low given that the garages are occupied independently to Chenies Court and are to a large extent vacant and/or poorly maintained. In some cases, it is evident that these are used for storage. The Inspector also noted that these garages would no longer comply with the space standards in the highway design guides and would not be capable of accommodating modern cars. Accordingly this led the Inspector to conclude that the impact arising from the removal of the garage courts would not be prejudicial to matters of highways safety nor unacceptable.
- 8.20 A submitted parking stress survey also indicated some spare capacity for on-street parking within the locality and its conclusions are still considered to be material to its consideration.
- 8.21 The parking stress survey concluded that the proposals would not contribute or exacerbate any parking stress nor would they be detrimental to highways safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Saved Policy 51 of the Local Plan 1991-2011 and Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)
- 8.22 It is anticipated that there will be no objections from the highway authority in relation matters of highways safety and parking.

---

<sup>2</sup> Based on allocated parking spaces for 6 x1 bed at 1.25 spaces (7.5) and 2 x 2 bed at 1.5 spaces (3). A lower standard is applicable where spaces are unallocated.

### Impact on Trees

- 8.23 The application is supported by an Arboricultural Report and Tree Constraints Plan. The assessment confirms that the development would not compromise the health and survival of existing trees around Chenies Court. There is a TPO covering Woodhall Farm (TPO29) which pre-dates the development of the estate and from which a number of trees can be identified around the periphery of the site(s)
- 8.24 The proposals require the pruning and maintenance of trees around the site(s). No trees are required to be removed to undertake development. All tree pruning will be undertaken in accordance with the submitted Method Statement and in accordance with British Standard BS: 3998:2010. The full extent of tree works include:
- Removal of tree T5 from G4 and G5<sup>3</sup> (Dead or diseased trees)
  - Pruning and reduction of a Walnut tree (T3) and a Lime within G3
  - Crown lifting a Cypress tree (T6) to 3m-3.5m above the existing and proposed access to car parking area and.
  - Crown lifting of a Lime within G3 from 1.8m to 2.5m above the pedestrian access to Plot B
- 8.25 There will be minor incursions within or adjacent to the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) and within the canopy spreads of trees as part of the development of the site. This would be necessary for the demolition of the garages, construction of buildings and the removal and/or replacement of hardstanding. Overall, the incursions within the RPAs have been assessed within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment to either have a minimal and insignificant impact on retained trees and as such would not form a basis for objection to this scheme.
- 8.26 The construction of the residential units will take place in less than 5% of the RPA of Ash and Lime trees within a group of trees (G1 and G3) but the impact is likely to be limited given the existing hard standing and extent of the root network.
- 8.27 The proposals are not considered to be detrimental to the long term health of the trees and would therefore be in accordance with Policies CS12, CS25 and CS26 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan in respect of trees and soft landscaping features.

### Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 8.28 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is a way of creating and improving natural habitats and makes sure that development has a measurably positive impact on biodiversity. There are some exceptions to the requirement to secure BNG as set out in the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.
- 8.29 This application is exempt from meeting the requirements for BNG. The proposal would meet the de-minimis exception due to the low level of habitat affected by the development and qualifying features. The sites are mainly hard standing areas with scrubland. There is considered scope to improve the overall biodiversity value of the site however through potential landscaping to the site including the strengthening of existing hedgerows at the site perimeter and by soft landscaping screens to the proposed building. It is considered appropriate that the site is subject to a landscaping condition seeking to reduce the visual impact of the development and its impact on the character and appearance of the countryside in this location. This would be in accordance with Policies CS12, CS25 and CS26 of the Core Strategy.

---

<sup>3</sup> It is recommended that these trees are removed irrespective of development for Arboricultural reasons.

### Impact on Ecology

- 8.30 There is no data to indicate the presence of protected species on the site as set out in the advice of the Hertfordshire Ecology Unit. The landscaping is such that the presence of protected species is considered low. The Ecology team have recommended a condition based on the pre-cautionary approach and this should be included within the conditions to be attached to this planning permission.
- 8.31 There are no reasons for the refusal of this application on ecological grounds. A standard landscaping condition should be sufficient to deliver improvements in the ecological and biodiversity value of the site.

### *Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation*

- 8.32 The application site is within the Zone of Influence of the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) The Council has a duty under Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (Regulation 63) and Conservation of Habitats and Species (EU exit amendment) Regulations 2019 to ensure that the integrity of the SAC is not adversely affected by new planning proposals.
- 8.33 The applicants can be provided with Strategic SANG in accordance with the Chiltern Beechwoods Mitigation Strategy and such mitigation will be secured via a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended)

### Other Material Planning Considerations

#### *Affordable Housing*

- 8.34 The proposed development would fall below the affordable housing threshold identified in Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy and as such no affordable housing units are to be provided by this development.

#### *Contamination*

- 8.35 Conditions are required to address the concerns of the contaminated land officer in respect of the use of the site for residential purposes. These will require the remediation of any contamination on the site(s) and the verification of such matters prior to the occupation of any residential units.

#### *Housing Land Supply*

- 8.36 The Council is unable to demonstrate a housing land supply in accordance with the NPPF and as such are bound under paragraph 11 of the NPPF to grant planning permission for sustainable development unless the adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development. In this instance, the Council cannot identify any harm resulting from this development that would not be outweighed in the planning balance by the delivery of housing.

#### *Noise*

- 8.37 The Environmental Health team have indicated that a condition should be provided to address issues of noise arising from development both from construction activities and from the future occupation of the development. Whilst the provision of a construction management plan is considered to be appropriate given the constraints of undertaking development upon these sites, a condition dealing with noise from future occupation is



considered to be otiose given the requirements of the Building Regulations and a lack of evidence to indicate a higher level or susceptibility of the development to noise. There is no evidence to suggest that noise associated with the occupation of these properties may be excessive or harmful to neighbouring properties. Furthermore, there is a statutory basis on which noise nuisance can be regulated under Environmental Health legislation such that the use of the planning system to address such matters is unnecessary.

#### *Infrastructure*

- 8.38 A number of residents have expressed concerns with the impact of the development upon infrastructure including schools, doctors and dentist provision. All new developments are expected to contribute towards on-site, local and strategic infrastructure needs arising as a result of development in accordance with Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy. The development will be required to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy in accordance with the Charging Schedule and this will be utilised to fund infrastructure improvements in the locality and wider town of Hemel Hempstead.

#### *Sustainable Construction*

- 8.39 Sustainable building design and construction is an essential part of the Council's response to the wider challenges of climate change, natural resource depletion, habitat loss and wider environmental and social issues. The Council expects buildings to be constructed to the highest design standards in accordance with Policies CS29, CS31 and CS32 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.40 The application is not accompanied by a Sustainability Statement indicating how the proposals would meet the requirements of the above policies. It is evident that the building will be constructed to meet the current Building Regulations including those parts relating to the use of energy, thermal efficiency and water. A proposed landscaping plan includes a number of new trees and hedges being planted within the development. The car parking plan has been updated to provide a number of EV charging points to serve the development.
- 8.41 It is considered that further information should be secured by a planning condition.

#### Neighbours Comments

- 8.42 The primary issues of concern have been addressed above. A number of other matters raised such as the loss of storage, the impact on property value and loss of view are not material to the consideration of this case.

### **9. CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The proposals are considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies CS4, CS8, CS12 and CS25 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies 51 and 99 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011. The scheme would deliver 8 high quality residential units within the area without causing harm to the appearance of the area, the amenities of neighbours or adverse ecological implications.

### **10 RECOMMENDATION.**

- 10.1 That planning permission is **DELGATED** with a **VIEW TO APPROVAL** subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure appropriate contributions towards SAMM and SANG in accordance with the Chiltern Beechwoods Mitigation Strategy and the following planning conditions.

**Conditions and Reasons:**

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:**

**CC2/24/LP01 (Location Plan)  
CC2/24/PL01 Revision B (Proposed Site Plan)  
CC2/24/PL02 Revision A (Site 1 – Plan)  
CC2/24/PL03 Revision A (Site 2 – Plan)  
CC2/24/PL04 (Site Plan 3)  
CC2/24/PL05 (Site 2 – Plans and Section)  
CC2/24/PL06 (Site 2 – Elevations)  
CC2/24/PL08 (Site 3 – Plans and Sections)  
CC2/24/PL09 Revision A (Site 3 – Elevations)**

**Arboricultural Report including Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement by David Clarke Landscape Architect dated April 2024**

**Design and Access Statement by Bell Cornwall dated July 2024**

**Ecology Appraisal by Cherryfield Ecology dated 21<sup>st</sup> June 2024**

**Phase 1 – Geo-Environmental Report by JNP Group**

**Tree Protection Plan by David Clarke Landscape Architect reference TPP/LCCHHH/010 Revision C**

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

3. **The development, hereby permitted, shall not commence until the tree protection measures have been provided in accordance with those described in Arboricultural Report including Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement by David Clarke Landscape Architect dated April 2024 and indicated on drawing TPP/LCCHHH/010 Revision C. These tree protection measures shall be retained for the duration of the demolition and construction period in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the adequate protection of existing landscape features in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

4. **No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

**5. No construction of the superstructure shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall be based on drawing LP/LCCHHH/020 and include:**

- all external hard surfaces within the site;
- other surfacing materials;
- means of enclosure;
- soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs;
- minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, signs, refuse or other storage units, etc.); and
- full details of measures to encourage and increase the biodiversity and ecological value (including those at Table 18 of the Ecological Appraisal) of the application site

**The planting and other landscaping works must be carried out within one planting season of completing the development.**

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

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

**6. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until full details of the sustainable construction measures incorporated within the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details prior to use.**

Reason: To ensure that appropriate sustainable construction measures are incorporated in the design of the proposals in accordance with Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy.

**7. 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.**

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.

**8. No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report (including an options appraisal and verification plan) has been submitted to and approved 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.

**9. 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 8 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.

**10. Prior to the commencement of development a Demolition and Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall cover the following matters:**

- the parking and turning of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- details of measures to prevent mud and other such material migrating onto the highway from construction vehicles;
- wheel washing facilities;
- measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during demolition and construction;
- a scheme for waste minimisation and recycling/disposing of waste resulting from the demolition and construction works, which must not include burning on site.
- design of construction access
- hours of demolition and construction works
- A methodology statement for the demolition of the existing garages and the safe disposal of any material
- control of noise and/or vibration and
- measures to control overspill of light from security lighting

**The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and the approved measures shall be retained for the duration of the demolition and construction works**

Reason: Details are required prior to the commencement of development in the interests of safeguarding highway safety and residential amenity of local properties 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 (2023).

**11. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the car parking area indicated on drawing CC2/24/PL02 Revision A has been laid out, surfaced and is ready for use (including the provision of EV charging points) by the occupants of the development. The parking area and electric vehicle charging points shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of car parking in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

12. **Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the windows within the flank elevations of the development hereby approved shall only be fitted with high level openings and obscure glazing. The obscure glazing shall be provided to a minimum of level 3 of the Pilkington scale.**

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.

## **INFORMATIVES**

### 1. Article 35

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Advice given to the applicant at the pre-application stage has been followed. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015

### 2. Working Hours 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.

As a guideline, the following hours for noisy works and/or deliveries should be observed: Monday to Friday, 7.30am to 5:30pm, Saturday, 8am to 1pm, Sunday and bank holidays - no noisy work allowed.

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 Team [ecp@dacorum.gov.uk](mailto:ecp@dacorum.gov.uk) or The Forum, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1DN. 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.

### 3. Construction Dust Informative

Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by carrying out of other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.

### 4. Waste Management Informative

Under no circumstances should waste produced from construction work 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.

#### 5. 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>

#### 6. Protected Species

If European Protected Species (EPS), including bats and great crested newts, or evidence for them, are discovered during the course of works, work must stop immediately, and advice sought on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England to avoid an offence being committed.

To avoid the killing or injuring of wildlife during development, best practice should keep any areas of grass as short as possible and any longer, ruderal vegetation should be cleared by hand. To avoid creating refugia that may be utilised by wildlife, materials should be carefully stored on-site on raised pallets and away from the boundary habitats. Any trenches on site should be covered at night or have ramps to ensure that any animals that enter can safely escape, and this is particularly important if excavations fill with water. Any open pipework with an outside diameter greater than 120mm must be covered at the end of each working day to prevent animals entering / becoming trapped.

In order to protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young, demolition or vegetation clearance 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.

#### 7. Contamination

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

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

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

## APPENDIX A: CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Herts LEADS	<p data-bbox="507 331 842 365"><u>Overall Recommendation</u></p> <p data-bbox="507 398 1441 495">This application can be determined with no ecological objections (with any Informatives/Conditions listed below) subject to the LPA being satisfied that HRA matters will be addressed.</p> <p data-bbox="507 533 767 566"><u>Summary of Advice</u></p> <ul data-bbox="507 600 1441 869" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strategic mitigation plan and evidence of payment of the appropriate tariff regarding mitigating impacts on the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) should be submitted to the LPA prior to determination.</li> <li>• An Informative for nesting birds should be added to any permission granted.</li> <li>• We support the recommended ecological enhancements and advise that these be integrated into the design of the new dwellings.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="507 902 807 936"><u>Supporting documents</u></p> <p data-bbox="507 969 1401 1003">I have made use of the following documents in providing this advice:</p> <ul data-bbox="507 1037 1369 1104" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological Appraisal (EA) by Cherryfield Ecology (21 June 2024).</li> <li>• Draft Deed of Unilateral Undertaking (2024).</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="507 1137 655 1171"><u>Comments</u></p> <p data-bbox="507 1205 687 1238"><u>Nesting Birds</u></p> <p data-bbox="507 1272 1441 1507">The Ecological Appraisal (EA) listed above identified suitable nesting habitat for breeding bird's onsite. 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. In order to reduce the risk of an offence being committed, a precautionary approach is required, and I therefore recommend the following Informative is added to any consent:</p> <p data-bbox="507 1541 1441 1809">"In order to protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young, vegetation clearance or demolition 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 data-bbox="507 1843 1026 1877"><u>Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)</u></p> <p data-bbox="507 1910 1441 2040">Given that the proposed development lies within the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) 'Zone of Influence', and that this development represents a net gain of eight residential units, we recommend that as the competent authority, the Council must</p>

undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).

This is because we consider there is a credible risk that harmful impacts from the increase in recreational pressure on the SAC (alone or in combination with other plans or projects) may arise and that likely significant effects cannot be ruled out.

If, following further 'appropriate assessment', the HRA is subsequently unable to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC, mitigation will be required. Effective mitigation will be best delivered by adopting the measures set out in the Council's strategic mitigation plan and the payment of the appropriate tariff(s). The latter will contribute to the implementation of 'strategic access management and mitigation measures' (SAMMs) alongside the creation of suitable alternative natural green spaces' (SANGs).

We acknowledge that a draft unilateral undertaking has been submitted in support of this application. Prior to determination, the LPA must be satisfied that such fees will be paid. As there is no indication within the application that this mitigation has been provided, it is our opinion that adverse effects cannot be ruled out. Consequently, this application cannot be determined until the LPA is satisfied that this matter is resolved. Natural England must be consulted on the outcome of the appropriate assessment.

#### Ecological Enhancements

We support the recommendations regarding ecological enhancements within Table 18 of the Ecological Appraisal listed above and advise that should be incorporated into the fabric of the design scheme as integrated bat boxes where possible and placed at least 3-4m above ground, oriented southwards and away from any artificial source of light in order to minimise disturbance.

#### Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

In England, BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, which came into effect on 12th February 2024, every grant of planning permission, subject to some exceptions, is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. The biodiversity gain planning condition does not apply in relation to the following exemption which the applicant states the application meets.

a) Development falls below the de minimis threshold:

A development that does not impact a priority habitat and affects less than:

- i. 25 square meters (5m by 5m) of on-site habitat.
- ii. 5 meters of on-site linear habitats, such as hedgerows.



	<p>The Ecology Service (LEADS) has not undertaken any scrutiny of the validity of the claimed exemption, but taking it at face value in this instance the requirement for mandatory 10% biodiversity gain does not apply.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Highways</p>	<p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>Comments Awaited</p> <p><u>Original Plans</u></p> <p>In order for HCC to be fully satisfied with the application, an amendment to the provided plans are requested. HCC as the Highway Authority are content with the principle of the application however, the proposed parking arrangement, shown on drawing number CC2/24/PL02, shows that the proposed parking spaces are to measure 2.4m x 4.8m in size. According to the HCC's new Place and Movement Planning Design Guide, parking spaces should measure 2.5m x 5m to ensure that they are adequate for modern vehicles. Additionally, the proposed disabled space at the site has been drawn to the same size as the other parking spaces when according to the PMPDG, disabled spaces should measure 5.5m in length and 2.9m wide with an extra 1m next to the space to allow room for the use of mobility aids. Once these amendments to the parking provision have been made, HCC will be in the position to provide full comments.</p>
<p>Conservation and Design</p>	<p>Prior to the previous appeal, Conservation and Design had 'previously commented that the development would not unduly impact the two Grade II listed barns at Barnes Farm' (5.8.3 Planning Statement), so this position remains unaffected by this re-submission.</p> <p>The revised designs appear to have addressed the reasons for dismissing the appeal – altering the designs and scale of one of the blocks to conform to the adjacent Chenies Court built environment. Whilst the results have a somewhat lacklustre appearance, the 2 blocks now work with the grain of their surroundings. Material choices will be important to ensure they blend in.</p>
<p>Environmental Health - Contamination</p>	<p>Having reviewed the planning application, in particular the JNP Group, Phase I Geo-Environmental Report 28/02/2022 M43930-JNP-XX-XX-RP-G-0001 P01 and considered the information held by the Environmental &amp; Community Protection (ECP) Team in relation to the application site I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed development.</p> <p>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 will be remediated.</p> <p>This is considered necessary as the site is brownfield with a proposed change of use from domestic garages to residential with private gardens.</p> <p>Contaminated Land Conditions:</p>

Condition 1:

(a) 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.

(b) 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 (including an options appraisal and verification plan); if required as a result of (b), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(c) 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

	<p>Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.</p> <p><u>Informative:</u> The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 180 (e) &amp; (f) and 189 and 190 of the NPPF 2023.</p> <p>Guidance on how to assess and manage the risks from land contamination can be found here:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/land-contamination-risk-management-lcrm">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/land-contamination-risk-management-lcrm</a> and here:  <a href="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</a></p>
Environmental Health	<p>Given the vicinity to existing residential premises we would request for the below conditions and informative to be considered.</p> <p>1. Prior to the commencement of development a Demolition and Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and the approved measures shall be retained for the duration of the demolition and construction works</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Details are required prior to the commencement of development in the interests of safeguarding highway safety and residential amenity of local properties 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 (2023).</p> <p><u>Informative:</u></p> <p>The Statement required to discharge the Demolition and Construction Management Plan condition of this consent is expected to cover the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•the parking and turning of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;</li> <li>•loading and unloading of plant and materials;</li> <li>•storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;</li> <li>•the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;</li> <li>•details of measures to prevent mud and other such material migrating onto the highway from construction vehicles;</li> <li>•wheel washing facilities;</li> <li>•measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during demolition and construction;</li> <li>•a scheme for waste minimisation and recycling/disposing of waste resulting from the demolition and construction works, which must not include burning on site.</li> <li>•design of construction access</li> <li>•hours of demolition and construction work</li> <li>•control of noise and/or vibration</li> <li>•measures to control overspill of light from security lighting</li> </ul>

2. Works audible at the site boundary will not exceed the following times unless with the written permission of the Local Planning Authority or Environmental Health. 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 (2023)

3. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for achieving the noise levels outlined in BS8233:2014 with regards to the residential units shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved the scheme shall be implemented before first occupation of the residential units and therefore maintained in the approved state at all times. No alterations shall be made to the approved structure including roof, doors, windows and external facades, layout of the units or noise barriers.

Reason: Details are required prior to the commencement of development in the interest 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 (2023)

Informative:

It should be noted that the Local Authority, in considering compliance with the noise scheme condition has regard to both internal and external amenity space noise levels. Applications may be refused where the external noise levels or internal noise levels with open windows do not meet the standards required. Whilst there is some flexibility to the standards outlined in BS8233:2014 this can only be applied where planning policy supports the need for the development.

The applicant shall have regard to the suitability of the type of residential accommodation in the proposed location and its design and layout before consideration of glazing and ventilation specifications.

The scheme can be informed by measurement and/or prediction using noise modelling provided that the model used has been verified. Only an appropriately qualified acoustic consultant will be able to carry out an assessment of the noise. The Institute of Acoustics website gives contact details of acoustic consultants - [www.ioa.org.uk](http://www.ioa.org.uk)

Additionally, I would recommend the application is subject to informative for waste management, construction working hours with Best Practical Means for dust, Air Quality and Invasive and Injurious Weeds which we respectfully request to be included in the decision notice.

Working Hours 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.

As a guideline, the following hours for noisy works and/or deliveries should be observed: Monday to Friday, 7.30am to 5:30pm, Saturday, 8am to 1pm, Sunday and bank holidays - no noisy work allowed.

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 Team [ecp@dacorum.gov.uk](mailto:ecp@dacorum.gov.uk) or The Forum, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1DN. 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.

#### Construction Dust Informative

Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by carrying out of other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.

#### Waste Management Informative

Under no circumstances should waste produced from construction work 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.

#### Air Quality Informative.

As an authority we are looking for all development to support sustainable travel and air quality improvements as required by the NPPF. We are looking to minimise the cumulative impact on local air quality that ongoing development has, rather than looking at significance. This is also being encouraged by DEFRA.

As a result as part of the planning application I would recommend that the applicant be asked to propose what measures they can take as part of this new development, to support sustainable travel and air quality improvements. These measures may be conditioned through the planning consent if the proposals are acceptable.

A key theme of the NPPF is that developments should enable future

	<p>occupiers to make “green” vehicle choices and (paragraph 35) “incorporates facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles”. Therefore an electric vehicle recharging provision rate of 1 vehicle charging point per 10 spaces (unallocated parking) is expected. To prepare for increased demand in future years, appropriate cable provision should be included in the scheme design and development, in agreement with the local authority.</p> <p>Please note that with regard to EV charging for residential units with dedicated parking, we are not talking about physical charging points in all units but the capacity to install one. The cost of installing appropriate trunking/ducting and a dedicated fuse at the point of build is miniscule, compared to the cost of retrofitting an EV charging unit after the fact, without the relevant base work in place.</p> <p>In addition, mitigation in regards to NOx emissions should be addressed in that all gas fired boilers to meet a minimum standard of 40 mg NOx/Kwh or consideration of alternative heat sources.</p> <p>Invasive and Injurious Weeds – Informative</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>
Natural England	<p>NATURAL ENGLAND’S ADVICE</p> <p>OBJECTION - FURTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED TO DETERMINE IMPACTS ON DESIGNATED SITES - DEVELOPMENT WITHIN 12.6 KILOMETRES OF CHILTERN’S BEECHWOODS SPECIAL AREA OF CONSERVATION (SAC) WITHIN 12.6 KILOMETRES</p> <p>Between 500 metres to 12.6km from Chilterns Beechwoods SAC, a Habitats Regulations Assessment is required to determine Likely Significant Effect. Mitigation measures will be necessary to rule out adverse effects on integrity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) or financial contributions towards a strategic SANG.</li> <li>• Financial contributions towards the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMB) strategy.</li> </ul> <p>Natural England requires further information in order to determine the significance of these impacts and the scope for mitigation.</p> <p>Please re-consult Natural England once this information has been obtained</p>

Footprint Ecology carried out research in 2021 on the impacts of recreational and urban growth at Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC), in particular Ashridge Commons and Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Due to this new evidence, Natural England recognises that new housing within 12.6km of the internationally designated Chilterns Beechwoods SAC can be expected to result in an increase in recreation pressure.

The 12.6km zone proposed within the evidence base<sup>1</sup> carried out by Footprint Ecology represents the core area around Ashridge Commons and Woods SSSI where increases in the number of residential properties will require Habitats Regulations Assessment. Mitigation measures will be necessary to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC from the cumulative impacts of development.

In addition Footprint Ecology identified that an exclusion zone of within 500m of the SAC boundary was necessary as evidence indicates that mitigation measures are unlikely to protect the integrity of the SAC.

Impacts to the SAC as a result of increasing recreation pressure are varied and have long been a concern. The report identified several ways in which public access and disturbance can have an impact upon the conservation interest of the site, these included:

- Damage: encompassing trampling and vegetation wear, soil compaction and erosion;
- Contamination: including nutrient enrichment (e.g. dog fouling), litter, invasive species;
- Fire: increased incidence and risk of fire; and
- Other: all other impacts, including harvesting and activities associated with site management.

In light of the new evidence relating to the recreation impact zone of influence, planning authorities must apply the requirements of Regulation 63 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, to housing development within 12.6km of the SAC boundary. The authority must decide whether a particular proposal, alone or in combination with other plans or projects, would be likely to have a significant effect on the SAC.

Natural England are working alongside all the involved parties in order to achieve a Strategic Solution that brings benefits to both the SAC and the local area to deliver high quality mitigation.

Once the strategy has been formalised all net new dwellings within the 500m - 12.6km zone of influence will be expected to pay financial contributions towards the formal strategy.

Consequently, it is Natural England's view that the planning authority will not be able to ascertain that this proposed development as it is currently submitted would not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC. In combination with other plans and projects, the development would be likely to contribute to a deterioration of the quality of the habitat by reason of increased access to the site including access for general

	recreation and dog-walking. There being alternative solutions to the proposal and there being no imperative reasons of overriding public interest to allow the proposal, despite a negative assessment, the proposal will not pass the tests of Regulation 64.
--	--

## APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Address	Comments
Arkley Court, Arkley Road	Not enough parking for current residents and increased congestion especially when the Woodhall Farm Community Centre is in use and during school hours. The new build flats will be extremely close to adjoining properties and this is not exactly fair. The plans are ridiculous and the area cannot cope with it.
24 Arkley Court, Arkley Road	I think building more flats on this area is not a good idea. Chenies Court residents need parking and turning this garage area into parking spaces would be much more acceptable for everyone concerned. Not having enough parking for Chenies Court resident's cause overflow parking problems for the surrounding area.
52 Arkley Court, Arkley Road	<p>There is already too many cars down Arkley Court and Chenie court due to the lack of parking. Majority of the time the entire residential street has a car parked on every available bit of curb. Adding 8 additional flats to an already over populated and overcrowded area is going to make the situation a lot worse.</p> <p>There is not the space for 8 additional flats, let alone the cars that come with that. If two people move into each flat and have a car of their own like most people do, that's an extra 16 cars to fit down an already crowded area.</p> <p>We have the community centre, the park and the local school which creates its own flow of traffic whether that's via car or on foot. This development would cause nothing but added stress on the already over populated and overcrowded area.</p> <p>There are flats being built all over Hemel Hempstead in areas that can accommodate the extra traffic and people, so why does this extra strain need to be put on a small residential road.</p> <p>Giving the garages back to Chenie's Court would allow for 16 extra parking spaces which would free up a lot of space on the road so vehicles can use it from both ways, currently it's like a single file road because the amount of cars. If this plan goes ahead it will be a huge disappointment and disruption to local residents. I am disabled and there are no disabled parking spaces down the whole street and due to its overcrowded, I've found myself having to park at a great distance from my flat and have injured myself on a few occasions, this is something that should be being looked into, not creating more issues.</p> <p>If this planning application goes ahead, I will look to move out the area, it's unsustainable and unfair on local residents. Has anyone</p>



	<p>even considered the noise pollution and disruption this massive project would cause</p>
14 Arkley Road	<p>The maintenance that the land is kept at now is bad enough. The trees are too high on the land. The council are removing the trees in the front of my property because they are dangerous. The council cannot do anything about the trees on this land as it is privately owned. The roots are growing under the house and blocking all the light into my property. I'm not the only resident who it effects</p>
18 Arkley Road	<p>We live in Arkley Road and will be in front of the proposed new parking area. This will mean the houses in front of the parking area will lose their privacy as well as extra noise and nuisance from people parking their cars in front. Not to mention people parking their cars there when dropping their kids to school which is already a problem in Arkley Road. Also, the trees in front of our property are overgrown and overgrown hedges and vegetation, without anyone taking responsibility for cutting them down or clearing the area which is starting to have rodent infestation. If this hasn't been taken care of for years, I can't see how this new area will be kept maintained at all. I fully oppose to this project unless we have assurances that a type of fence will be built in the parking area to protect the privacy of the properties in front of it as well as full clearance and maintenance of the trees and hedges on that area.</p>
2 Bramfield Place	<p>I object to this development due to the impact it will have on the residents of Woodhall Farm and the precedence it will set.</p> <p>There is already a lack of infrastructure in place to support the current housing estate to add to it would be madness. Surrounding roads are not able to sustain the existing residents with parking and highways impacts already happening which will be amplified by this development as the parking proposed is insufficient and not designed for modern car sizes so will result in more on road parking further impacting local residents. Schools are already struggling to take the volume of pupils. Roads are already overcrowded with vehicles especially at school pick up times which is causing chaos for residents and causing additional pollution. Local dentists and Dr's are not taking on further patients and have long waiting lists. Water pressure and sewerage are already being impacted since the addition of Swallowfields so to add to this drain on resources even further should not be considered by DBC.</p> <p>The proximity to existing buildings will severely impact the quality of life for existing residents due to causing a lack of light into their homes, intrusive views from windows in the building and gardens which will also compromise security and the peace of mind to enjoy their homes for these residents, a feeling of overcrowding and being hemmed in will happen on an estate that was designed to be open plan and encourage outdoor spaces, poor design overall as the planned buildings don't sit well with the existing neighbouring buildings and do not mirror the planners vision for the estate when built.</p> <p>The lack of thought for the community and complete lack of</p>

	<p>consultation with local residents clearly shows the developers are purely looking to make a profit and do not care about the impact on local residents or wildlife, the proposed removal of trees with Tree Protection Orders to enable this development should be prevented and as per the comments of Natural England and other bodies. DBC should preventing building anywhere near the Ashridge protected areas.</p> <p>DBC needs to take a stance and put the existing residents of Woodhall Farm first by not allowing projects like this to be built and instead encourage garage owners to either keep them in a fit state to be used for small modern cars or ensure they are only turned into further residents parking which will benefit the communities these spaces are in.</p>
3 Chalfont Close	<p>Most properties have at least 2 vehicles. The parking in our road is awful as it is without extra flats being built. Cars are parked on the pavement making it impossible for wheelchair users and buggies to get through.</p> <p>More flats, more cars, more queues to get off the estate in the mornings, more noise, more pollution, more cars parked on the pavements. Additional danger to children crossing the roads to get to school. It seems like every piece of spare land is being built on and we are being crammed in like sardines. Please stop.</p>
5 Chalfont Close	<p>This proposed development will further add to the increasing issues brought about by lack of parking in the area, it is becoming very congested in and around Chenies Court and Chalfont Close especially at school start and finish times when some residents have to negotiate cars parked so close to their drives that it is almost impossible to get in or out, the proposal for 8 flats is going to add to the problem regardless of the additional parking, which I note is at least 2 spaces fewer than likely to be needed, the residents around here have on occasions taken to parking in adjacent streets when they are unable to park outside their own property this simply adds to the issues in surrounding streets.</p> <p>Whilst I accept that we need to increase housing stock the addition of 8 flats will only serve to make a developer happy and put further pressure on those already living in the area, having had first-hand experience of DBC planning department in recent years I have little faith in the department to fully take account of the needs of the residents, however on this occasion I would like to believe that common sense will prevail and they will see that this development is unnecessary and unwanted and frankly will only serve to impact on the residents in the surrounding area in ways that will inevitably cause friction, there are already issues with people living in the flats at the far end of Chalfont Close parking outside houses at the start of the close because they are unable to park closer to their own homes, this proposed development will almost certainly impact on Chalfont Close when the Chenies Court parking becomes saturated.</p> <p>I would not like to believe that DBC are so insensitive to the local residents feelings that they will simply push this through without taking</p>

	<p>account of the effect it will have not only as a finished development but also during said development, perhaps it would be sensible for someone from planning to actually visit Chenie's Court when the schools return to see what impact the increased traffic has at the school times, this may help them understand what impact this development will have not just at school times but throughout the day and night. Do the right thing by the residents and refuse this application.</p>
16 Chalfont Close	<p>I completely object to the proposed building of the flats. Having previously lived in Chenies Court I know how bad the parking is, as it is. Residents already struggle to park, having to use the community centre for parking. It's impossible to get Dr's apts as it is, schooling and dentists won't have been taken into consideration when this plan was submitted.</p>
21 Chalfont Close	<p>This development will only cause more parking issues in the surrounding area. With 8 flats there will be at least a requirement of 16 parking spaces. In Chalfont Close we have already experienced more parking problems since the development of Chalfont Mews.</p>
22 Chalfont Close	<p>It is very disappointing that broadly the same proposal, previously rejected by the planning officer, is once again up for consideration.</p> <p>None of the previous concerns raised by many others and I have changed and in some cases are now worse. The substantial further expansion of the nearby Swallow Fields already threatens to place yet greater strain on the already stretched schools and doctors in Woodhall Farm, which would be yet further exacerbated by this proposed development.</p> <p>As raised in my previous objection, the parking offered for the new development is insufficient for the average number of cars likely to be owned by the occupants of the proposed development. There is already a problem across Woodhall Farm generally with a significant amount of on-road parking and will make it harder still for visitors to existing residents to park.</p> <p>From an appearance and feel perspective, Woodhall Farm is lucky to not currently suffer the very tightly packed style of construction that plagues modern housing development. I am of the opinion that the local area maintains a pleasant and friendly feel, which is in part due to the sensible layout proposed and implemented nearly 50 years ago. To approve a high occupancy development in amongst this well considered arrangement threatens both the character of the local area and risks setting a precedent leading to yet further densification in other currently undeveloped plots of land.</p> <p>I strongly object to this proposal.</p>
23 Chalfont Close	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. It has negative impact on residents and the local community as others pointed out.</p> <p>We are already suffering from parking nuisance where driveways get blocked because there is no other choice. The planned parking is</p>

	<p>unsustainable/inadequate for the planned flats so it only get worse over time.</p> <p>Block B (site 3) potentially causes loss of privacy for blocks/houses nearby.</p> <p>This is a small area, over-development potentially decrease the value of our property. There are already new developments site nearby to provide more house. There is no need to pack these 8 flats in a tight corner.</p>
24 Chalfont Close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Affect local ecology</li> <li>- Close to adjoining properties</li> <li>- General dislike of proposal</li> <li>- Loss of light</li> <li>- Loss of parking</li> <li>- Loss of privacy</li> <li>- Over development</li> <li>- Strain on existing community facilities</li> <li>- Traffic or Highways</li> </ul> <p>Generally totally opposed to this development.</p> <p><u>Additional Comments</u></p> <p>Totally against, the garages could be made into car parking facilities for existing flats as not enough parking spaces along our road in Chalfont and driveways get blocked in. Also will generate less privacy and devalue our property.</p>
25 Chalfont Close	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There will be light loss to neighbouring properties and lack of privacy due to the positioning of the proposed flats.</li> <li>2. We believe the additional traffic will impact on children's road safety with more cars parked along roads which are on a route to a busy school entrance, community centre and play park. Crossing roads with the current volume of traffic and parked cars, especially at school start and finish times, is already dangerous enough.</li> <li>3. The additional cars parking in an area which cannot cope with the current volume will impact hugely in our road and others in the area. The parking provided will not be sufficient and is a distance from the new flats leading to further strains on nearby parking.</li> <li>4. More residents in an area where it is already almost impossible to get a doctor's appointment, and dentists have long waiting lists, will lead to additional strain on these facilities.</li> </ol>
28 Chalfont Close	<p>I strongly object. Where they are proposing to build these flats is ridiculous. There isn't enough parking in the local area as it is and most families have 2 cars per household. Cars already have to park along the sides of the streets and in a layby down by Chalfont Mews.</p> <p>We will lose any privacy as the flats will be so close and they will be overlooking our bedrooms which will make us uncomfortable and insecure in our own home.</p>

	<p>We will be living on top of each other and will have extra noise right next to my son's bedroom.</p> <p>Also there tends to be issues with overflowing bins and fly tipping where flats are built and this will be right next to our bedroom windows and will smell in the summer. We already have a bin store the other side.</p> <p>These flats will also decrease the value of our property due to over development in the area.</p> <p>I have objected before and will do so again. Why build on every bit of land and pack us in.</p>
31 Chalfont Close	<p>I completely object to the proposed plans for demolishing 3 garage blocks in Chenies Court and the proposed building of 8 flats and parking, especially those for site 3, as this building will significantly impact my security and quality of life within my home.</p> <p>The proposed building at site 3 will significantly affect the amount of light to my property, in particular it will affect the bedrooms within the property creating a dark and horrible space to live in, the ability to have windows or doors open for fresh air will also be affected as it will impact the air flow and increase airborne pollution during and after the building process which will in turn cause further issues for the Chalfont Close flats who back on to the proposed site 3.</p> <p>The proposed building on site 3 will also massively compromise my privacy as the building will have windows that look directly into the bedrooms of my property and will result in never being able to have curtains open at bedroom windows without compromising both my privacy and ability to use my home in the way it was designed.</p> <p>An ongoing issue with lack of both on street and off street parking will be further exacerbated as most households have 2 vehicles and the proposed parking for this development will not address this as it only allows for parking for a single vehicle for each property putting further strain on the already congested surrounding roads in particular Chalfont Close due to its closeness to the proposed site 3.</p> <p>Noise will significantly increase for residents of Chalfont Close flats if this development proceeds on site 3 as the proposed gardens back on to our bedrooms and the proximity of the proposed flats and use of said gardens will increase the noise due to the current garages acting as a very good buffer for noise between the existing blocks of flats, this will be extremely detrimental to the existing property owners and affect quality of life as we will never have peace and quiet in our homes again in particular our bedrooms and ability to sleep will be majorly affected by both the proposed buildings / gardens and during the building works if this proposal goes ahead.</p> <p>The proposed buildings are not only not in keeping with the existing buildings in the area but also visually intrusive as instead of blue sky I will only see shadows and a building / fence when looking out of my bedroom window if the proposal for site 3 goes ahead.</p>

	<p>Local Sewerage, roads, schools, Doctors and Dentists cannot cope with additional demand and this will cause further strain on extremely stretched local services. Sewerage has already leaked on to the grounds of Chalfont Close flats on multiple occasions due to the existing sewers for buildings in Chenies Court and their inability to cope / very poor drainage within the area to further add to this issue would be negligent of the council and further impact the quality of life for those living in Chalfont Close flats.</p> <p>These plans are complete over development of the area, too close to existing homes and will have a detrimental impact on all properties surrounding them and lives of those who already live there, DBC has a responsibility to existing households to ensure their quality of life is not impacted by over development in the way these plans would impact our lives so I implore DBC to reject these plans and prioritize the well-being of existing residents and homes.</p>
32 Chalfont Close	<p>I completely object to this application as I think it will make parking for the current residence even worse than it already is. It will also cause more noise, nuisance, pollution and frankly would not want to lose all the daily light residents in Chalfont Close have.</p> <p>I also feel that building new properties in such a small area would affect lives of all the residents in surrounding buildings and cause unnecessary stress and affect everybody s wellbeing.</p>
39 Chalfont Close	<p>I object to this development. The area is already overcrowded and the infrastructure cannot cope with extra traffic and people. There is currently not enough room for all the local residents to park. This is before extra flats and families are added into the area. The flats will overlook our properties taking light. None of the local residents want this application to be successful as I have spoken to all my neighbours. It will have a major impact on all our lives, causing massive disruption and stress to all of us.</p>
40 Chalfont Close	<p>Further development will bring excessive demands on parking and local services e.g doctors/hospitals. I live neighbouring Chenies Court and parking is hard enough. With the addition of these flats there will be people trying to park everywhere. Woodland at the back of Chalfont Close will be affected as there will be more pollution and upheaval for local wildlife.</p> <p>I object totally to this application</p>
48 Chalfont Close	<p>Parking is already under pressure in the area. All the streets are parked up after hours and weekends. The existing community facilities are already stretched and additional residential development would put that under even more pressure.</p> <p>Increased traffic so close to the Junior School, as well as increased traffic getting out of Woodhall Farm at the junction between Shenley Drive and Redbourn Road is not acceptable.</p> <p>There is nothing good about this development. Feels more like a 'land</p>

	<p>grab' than having the existing communities best interest in mind</p> <p><u>Additional Comments</u></p> <p>I object to the proposed development in this area due to the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Insufficient Parking: The area already lacks adequate parking. Increased development will worsen congestion and further limit parking for current residents.</li> <li>- Close Proximity to Existing Buildings: The proposed development is too close to current buildings, reducing privacy, natural light, and increasing noise pollution.</li> <li>- Inadequate Infrastructure: Current infrastructure does not support additional development.</li> <li>- Overdevelopment: The proposed development will overcrowd the area and negatively impact its character, open spaces, and overall quality of life.</li> </ul> <p>Please reconsider this development due to its negative impact on residents and the local community.</p>
56 Chalfont Close	<p>I strongly object to the proposed demolition of the garages in Chenies Court and the construction of 6 studio flats for site 2 and 2 x 2 bedroom apartments for site 3 in their place - we do not need any more housing in the area - the land would be of much better use as parking facilities for the residents of Chenies Court! Many of the garages are used as storage for the local residents.</p> <p>In Chalfont Close we are already seriously impacted with parking especially in the evenings and weekends with cars being parked nose to nose and even on the pavements which I thought was only available for pedestrians, wheelchairs/mobility scooters and buggies!</p> <p>Access to the school would also be impacted with the parking as the parents drop their children off at the school entrance which always causes mayhem every day.</p> <p>The proposed allocation of 13 bays of parking for site 1 does not equate to possible 12 cars in site 2 (2 cars per flat) and 4 cars in site 3 = 16 cars - who works out the maths for that!</p> <p>Wildlife would also be badly affected with all the noise and disruption to their habitat. Loss of privacy and added noise would also be a big problem for the residents in the Chalfont Close flats with the proposed site 3.</p> <p>Having lived in Chalfont Close for over 45 years it used to be a safe place for children to play outside but with the proposal and extra parking problem it will make it a dangerous place for the children.</p> <p>I reiterate - I strongly object to this application.</p>

	<p><u>Additional Comments</u></p> <p>Totally opposed to the proposal which has no regard to the existing residents in Chenies Court or Chalfont Close as to their wellbeing. The increased parking difficulties would be further exasperated by this proposal already having cars parked on pavements making it extremely difficult for pedestrians, wheelchair/mobility scooters or buggies to get around.</p> <p>Local services in the area e.g doctors, dentists, schools etc are already stretched to bursting point making it very difficult to get appointments so this proposal would only make matters much worse.</p> <p>The proposed extra parking is just not sufficient for the amount of flats planned - if anything we need more car parking facilities NOT housing. The plans are also too close to existing properties.</p> <p>Local wildlife would also be at risk with their habitat under threat let alone the extra noise to be endured if these plans went ahead.</p> <p>So please DBC do the right thing by all of us current residents and reject this ridiculous proposal.</p>
57 Chalfont Close	<p>I completely object to this development on Chenies Court. The privacy to the nearby flats will be unsuitable for the residents. The parking on Chalfont Close will also be affected whereby our road is already inundated with cars on our road as it is. I understand if these developments go ahead there will be the possibility of a development happening in the garages at the end of Chalfont Close. The parking then will also affect the whole road. Even now the emergency vehicles some evenings would not be able to get down the road in a severe emergency the way people park. Our safety is paramount. The developments are also very close to the back gate of the local school which could have a detrimental effect on the young children walking to and from school.</p>
58 Chalfont Close	<p>Please include our objection to the Chenies Court flats .The reasons are mainly the absolute stupidity of such a major project and no pre warning, no planning for car parking already a problem. No doubt this will get the nod and someone will pocket a fortune, but the residents will just have to put with all the problems</p> <p><u>Additional comments:</u></p> <p>Please note my objection to this. Car parking Water Drainage, just to mention a couple of points</p>
59 Chalfont Close	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. I have lived in Chalfont close over 43 years and have seen an influx of new residents, most of whom have at least 2 cars per house. There is more problems with parking spaces and as a result double parking which proves a danger to children to and from school.</p> <p>Increase in residents will also place more pressure, on all already stretched services ie: Doctors, dentist and school entries.</p>



	<p>As we have a large number of retirees, the pollution from the emissions is quite concerning and can result in them having respiratory problems. There is also a concern to our security being compromised, as we are all aware of home invasion over the last few years.</p>
63 Chalfont Close	<p>Parking is already inadequate, this would have a really negative impact on current residents in this area, which is not suitable for any further development of properties.</p>
2 Chalfont Mews	<p>I object to any planning for flats in replace of the garages.</p> <p>We have lived in Chalfont Mews for 7 years and chose this area for its quite, green community. Building flats will be detrimental to the area. This will cause a loss of privacy in our road with flats overlooking our gardens and directly into our homes.</p> <p>This will cause a negative impact to noise and continued disturbance as well as extra lighting in our quite homes.</p> <p>The Traffic Increase will causing noise and pollution to our homes as well as traffic congestion and lack of parking spaces which we already have issues with.</p> <p>This will cause environmental damage to our blossoming local wildlife, trees, and ecosystems</p> <p>More homes will cause a huge negative impact on the already strained local services such as schools, GP's Dentists, hospitals and sewage systems.</p>
3 Chalfont Mews	<p>Parking is already near enough impossible, this would have a really negative impact on current residents.</p>
3 Chenies Court	<p>I object to the proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inadequate Car Parking</li> <li>- Loss of Car Parking</li> <li>- General dislike of proposals.</li> </ul>
9 Chenies Court	<p>More parking requirements need to be addressed for the existing tenants of Chenies Court/Arkley Road.</p> <p>There is already insufficient parking for current residents and increased congestion especially when the Woodhall Farm Community Centre is in use. Cramming additional flats will only exacerbate the situation and will not be in keeping with the existing flats/houses.</p>
14 Chenies Court	<p>As the owner and occupier my back garden and patio would be overlooked and the early sunrise would be blocked. There would be an unacceptable increase in parking requirements which are already a problem before any increase in housing density.</p> <p>There is a need to look forward to requirements for electrical charging for cars owned by residents of the flats in Chenies Court. Any planning</p>

	<p>should take account of net zero by 2030. I applaud the local Connected Kerb initiative.</p>
<p>18 Chenies Court</p>	<p>Building these flats will take away the residents garages.</p> <p>The parking is not adequate at present as most homes now have at least two cars so this will only increase the problem and create a safety issue especially for children walking to school.</p> <p>The local dentist, doctor and schools are full so no extra capacity.</p> <p>There are many new houses and flats being built near Woodhall Farm. What is the need to build flats in an already busy area? Approving this development will lead the way for other garage areas being converted which is not what any residents want. We cannot lose more space and green areas.</p>
<p>19 Chenies Court</p>	<p>We object for the following reasons:</p> <p>Quality of life will be effected for every that lives here currently due to the parking situation</p> <p>There is not enough places as it is &amp; it's hard when visitors come plus we have a community centre &amp; school which block the road when parking their cars here during events.</p> <p>Yes they mention 8 new spaces to go with the new flats but everyone will have 2 cars In each house hold (more than likely which means they will park in the limited spaces we already have. We also believe this will cause privacy &amp; overcrowding issues with people living on top of each other.</p>
<p>20 Chenies Court</p>	<p>This is just not feasible in this area. The plans are ridiculous and just seem to be squeezing in housing when the area cannot cope with it. We don't have enough parking as it is round here and the "extra" parking would not be useable by the residents who already live here.</p> <p>People use the garages already there as the flats simply are not big enough for families to live.</p> <p>The garage areas are not taken care of now so I doubt that will change if any works are agreed.</p> <p>We do not have enough Dr's, Dentists or schools in this area to accommodate more people or more housing. Please do not agree this unnecessary building works in an already overpopulated area.</p> <p><u>Additional Comments</u></p> <p>I completely oppose the planned works for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*already not enough parking for the properties in Chenies Court.</li> <li>*not enough Dr's,dentists or schools for the current residents due to the large estate built and no schools build for that estate.</li> <li>* the parking is too far away from the planned properties which means</li> </ul>

	<p>more chaos for already busy area.  *refuse collections are already hindered due to the amount of vehicles already in the area.</p> <p>Please refuse this ridiculous plans in such a small area.</p>
21 Chenies Court	<p>I object to this development for a number of reasons.</p> <p>Parking is already extremely difficult in Chenies Court, Arkley Road and Datchet Close, adding more properties will only increase the parking issues.</p> <p>Parking for the current residents is inadequate, it is extremely hard to find parking in the evenings and weekends. 13 parking bays for 8 flats is not enough, most 1 bedroom flats have 2 cars associated to them as well as additional cars for visitors, where are these meant to go, add them to the non-existing parking for current residents? I also do not understand how an accessible parking bay can be out so far away from the proposed properties, it looks too small so the size would need increasing which means even less spaces for the proposed additional properties. What would be done to stop the drivers of the cars in the proposed car park from leaving their lights on while they are idling and shining brightly into the properties by the car park?</p> <p>The roads are already extremely tight to drive round with the current parking situation and emergency vehicles would struggle to get to the existing properties so adding more properties and vehicles would be irresponsible.</p> <p>I cannot see any benefit to these properties being built, only the negative impact that this will have to the area with more cars, more pollution, further strain on local amenities such as doctors and the detrimental effect to the wildlife that lives within close proximity to the proposed development. There is already another housing development taking place approximately half a mile away, as well as others close by, why are these needed as well?</p> <p>The noise, mess and disruption this will have on existing residents is not fair, there are lots of children in area who play outside and this will make it very dangerous for them to do so and they will be forced to stay inside. This development will do nothing but cause noise and disruption to people's lives and it will no longer be the lovely quiet area that is currently is.</p> <p>Please sort out the issues for existing residents before adding more and making the situation even worse.</p>
23 Chenies Court	<p>This is ridiculous, there is not enough parking around here and the extra parking that will be made will not be parking for the current residents who already live here.</p> <p>The parking when the schools are on are currently crazy as it is, with school parents parking in resident spaces as it is first come first serve, so trying to add housing and parking to an already busy community is a ridiculous idea.</p>

	<p>The new properties will also mean that there will be a loss of privacy when looking out of the current buildings windows.</p>
27 Chenies Court	<p>I've lived in Chenies Court for 20yrs and over the last 5yrs it has changed. There is no parking for the residents who live here already and I even have to park on the pavement the same as over residents which is not ideal at all. Most people have 2 cars per household nowadays. The traffic is ridiculous in the morning trying to get out my road especially with the school so close. Trees would need cutting down which I'm not happy with, we have hedgehog houses where we are and with more development we will lose the already endangered wildlife in the area.</p>
28 Chenies Court	<p>I object to the proposed plans. The development of existing flats and houses surrounding Chenies Court already is already problematic in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The access road to Chenies Court is narrow and access further restricted by parked cars</li> <li>- At most times, demand for parking exceeds supply</li> <li>- The local community centre and school add to the demand for parking</li> </ul> <p>I object to the addition of more flats as these would only exacerbate the current issues and result in overdevelopment of the area.</p> <p>In addition new flats would encroach on the privacy of adjacent properties, in particular the gardens of the houses.</p> <p>Returning the garages for residents use as originally intended would be far more beneficial for the existing community.</p> <p>In summary, I believe that further property development would negatively impact the daily lives of existing residents and ultimately the market value of their properties.</p>
29 Chenies Court	<p>This application is absolutely ridiculous! The current parking situation is already horrendous and adding more flats to the area will cause utter chaos. The residents (and owners) already struggle to find adequate parking and storage for belongings.</p> <p>This area is also full of wildlife and many of the trees are home to a variety of birds.</p> <p>This would be massively affected, especially if building works were to commence. Furthermore, the increased costs for all current residents due to sheer amount of dust and debris that would be produced. The service charges are already extremely high and this would have to increase to cover any extra cleaning required.</p> <p>There are lots of families living in the flats and this would also cause huge dangers with the equipment and resources required to complete such works. It is also already over populated without additional flats being</p>

	<p>added! How about look after the residents who are already here and provide them more sufficient parking and outside areas?</p> <p><u>Additional Representations</u></p> <p>My family relies heavily on the garage to store many of our belongings, as our two-bedroom flat doesn't provide enough space. The garage is essential to us, and losing it would be a significant hardship. Without the garage, our quality of life would diminish considerably.</p> <p>Additionally, our service charge is already high, and since we aren't permitted to store items in the hallways, we have no other place to keep what we currently store in the garage if it is demolished.</p> <p>We also use the garage area as a communal space to gather with other residents in the flats, as it is a sizable area.</p> <p>There is already extensive development happening in Woodhall Farm, with nearly every available piece of land being built upon.</p>
36 Chenies Court	<p>I strongly object to the proposed application.</p> <p>There will be light loss to neighbouring properties and lack of privacy due to the positioning of the proposed flats.</p> <p>The noise will increase for all residents of Chenies court, Chalfont Close and other neighbours which in turn will affect quality of life which is not fair on any of the residents.</p> <p>Many necessary facilities are already struggling to cope and this will cause further strain - an example being numerous sewerage leaks onto the grounds as well as very poor drainage within the area.</p> <p>There is already not enough car parking for residents for Chalfont Close or Chenies court and by adding more flats with insufficient parking will just add to this. The stress and safety levels of residents when trying to find parking especially in the evenings and at night times will be made worse which will impact on well-being.</p> <p>On road parking already sometimes causes obstructions which will be made worse if this development goes ahead, causing access issues for the emergency services which surely needs to be considered.</p> <p>This would be a complete over development of the area and the proposed is too close to adjoining properties. This in turn will also increase traffic and pollution in an already congested area causing strains on the existing road and other infrastructures.</p>
38 Chenies Court	<p>We believe that building flats where the existing garages are located will cause a strain on the parking in the area. It is already very hard to find parking during the evenings and having a young child we do not want to have to be parking any further away than we already have to at times.</p> <p>Furthermore, the location of the new flats will mean that there will be blocks of flats very close together many that block the light entering some of the flats and also potentially some flats with windows looking directly into each other.</p>

	<p>We feel that with the growing population already living at Chenies Court those garages could be much better put to use by providing parking for the local area.</p>
39 Chenies Court	<p>The parking in Chenies Court/Arkley Road is not good at the moment and if new flats are erected then this will make the situation much more hectic and put a lot of stress on our neighbours and myself. These new flats will be extremely close to adjoining properties and this is not exactly fair.</p> <p>I wholly object to the building of new flats.</p>
43 Chenies Court	<p>To build on this particular site will spoil the sense of openness as well as blocking out the light and views from certain of the flats. The actual new building proposed does not blend in with established brick work or window conformity. I think a better idea would be to demolish the garages and put in additional parking places with electric charging stations for electric cars which will become a necessity in the future. One final point car parking is already at a premium and this proposed building will only add to this.</p>
48 Chenies Court	<p>I object to the planning application 24/01755/FUL for the following reasons: -</p> <p>Four Daughters Estates Limited owns the three garage areas adjacent to Chenies Court. In 1980 Fairview Estates split off garages from blocks of flats and Chenies Court Associates have been unable to claim them back.</p> <p>Four Daughters Estates Limited wanted an application in July 2022 to knock down the garages and put up flats and it was refused. An appeal was dismissed in November 2023. All good for us!</p> <p>Now they have tried again in July 2024 and earlier.</p> <p>The first that Chenies Court Associates Limited heard about this was on the 19th August 2024. We have worked with people in the following roads: Chenies Court: 1 - 48. Chalfont Close and Chalfont Mews: 1-72. Arkley Road: 2-18. Arkley Court: 2-66. Datchet Close: 2-30.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We do not need any more flats in Chenies Court. We need more parking spaces</li> <li>2. There is not much parking space in Chenies Court and it's the same in all the roads above.</li> <li>3. There is an excess of cars, which leads to overall pavement parking.</li> <li>4. There are parking problems all over Woodhall Farm.</li> <li>5. Modern cars don't rust quickly and they have better alarm systems out in the open, (assuming they can find a space).</li> <li>6. Electric cars need charging and while they can be done from houses, they would be very difficult to do it from the flats.</li> <li>7. If the Four Daughters put up flats, they would never blend in with the</li> </ol>

	existing flats.
18 Datchet Close	<p>I object to this project. There's no consideration for parking in this area. The place is already congested with cars on pavements, and residents not finding a suitable parking spot.</p> <p>It will also take away from the open space, making the area very congested.</p>
30 Datchet Close	<p>As the owner and occupier of 30 Datchet Close I am concerned privacy will be affected as the flats would overlook our garden through the height and also the tree that would need to be cut down There would be extra noise created by the flats. We do not have adequate parking now!!!</p> <p>We desperately need more parking and by knocking down the existing garages a reasonable car park could be created. We would also have a loss of view.</p> <p>This proposal would be a massive nuisance to the current residences with pollution and construction of the flats plus could be a danger to the residents and their property.</p>
36 Deaconsfield Road	There is at the moment not enough parking for the flats that are already there. If more flats are added the parking situation will get even worse.
18 Hunting Gate	<p>I object to the planning application 24/01755/FUL for the following reasons: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chenies Court is a narrow road where the width is reduced by parked cars.</li> <li>2. There is already limited space in Chenies Court and Arkley Road for vehicles to pass one another and for parking.</li> <li>3. The houses in Chenies Court have a single driveway parking space which is inadequate for their needs and necessitates pavement parking.</li> <li>4. Currently there are an excess of cars which leads to overall pavement parking.</li> <li>5. At peak times, access to the Community Centre and local school increases traffic flow in Arkley Road.</li> <li>6. Overspill cars from Datchet Close park anywhere they can find a space either in Chenies Court and Arkley Road.</li> </ol> <p>As public transport declines and car ownership increases, the addition of a further 8 dwellings will exacerbate this already cramped and difficult situation.</p> <p>The growing existing community would be better served by having the garages demolished for increased parking capacity.</p>
51 Perry Green	<p>Building these flats will take away the residents garages and communal space which they rely upon. It will lead to stress and mental health issues.</p> <p>As many have commented the parking is not adequate at present so this</p>

	<p>will only increase the problem and create a safety issue especially for children walking to school.</p> <p>The local dentist doctor and school are full. There are many new houses and flats being built not far from Woodhall Farm. What is the need to build flats in an already busy area?</p> <p>Approving this development will lead the way for other garage areas being converted which is not what any residents want. Residents purchased properties here due to the space and green areas which we are losing. Surely resident's opinions should be very important when looking at developments near to their property.</p>
<p>Stuart House 1 Ferrers Hill Farm Pipers Lane (owner of 33 Chenies Court.)</p>	<p>Looking at the plans, it is disappointing to note that the developer has not interacted with the neighbourhood at all, has not sought any comment or consultation from the neighbourhood. has not done any form of traffic survey or effect on the immediate area.</p> <p>At certain times of day traffic is very large due to the local community facilities and the transport of children.</p> <p>At other times of day, parking is far too limited already with cars parking on pathways, and damage done to various vehicles because access is already very limited.</p> <p>I would recommend the Planning Officer undertakes a site visit at least at two different times of day so that it can be established that parking is extremely limited at all times.</p> <p>The developer has taken no account of parking limitations and there is no facility for visitor spaces. The number of properties multiplied by two beds means there is a 100% certainty that visitors - let alone the new number of residents - will need parking facilities that have not been allowed for. The developer has prioritised living space above parking space, with the former obviously having a greater commercial value and profit.</p> <p>The plans make no mention of any public benefits that would outweigh the extra issues, pressure, and safety arising from the increased traffic and number of people in a small space. It limits openness even further, and increases the density of dwellings with nothing in return for the local community.</p> <p>I object to this proposal and suggest the developer needs to provide much more information and analysis to support the arguments because clearly the amount of people saying exactly the same thing on parking means there must be an issue to address before any thought can be given to a planning approval.</p> <p>Whilst I understand that development is an evolutionary process, this must be done with due consideration to the issues that may be caused or exist once the original developer has long gone. The fact that the developer has remained silent on the parking and access issue evidences that more work is needed here, and the developer knows that.</p>
<p>9 The Rhymes</p>	<p>To build additional dwellings in this tight and compact cul de sac really seems like a crazy proposal. I'm sure there are more suitable locations available</p>