

ITEM NUMBER: 5a

24/02115/FUL	Loft conversion with rear dormer, and 3M rear extension to facilitate a Change of use from Class C3 to Sui Generis (9-Person HMO), with internal alterations.	
Site Address:	5 Christchurch Road, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, HP2 5BX	
Applicant/Agent:	C/O Dimensions	Mr David Gutwirth
Case Officer:	Lois-May Chapman	
Parish/Ward:	Hemel Hempstead (No Parish)	Hemel Hempstead Town
Referral to Committee:	Called in by Ward Councillor on regards to concern over parking and residential amenity	

1. RECOMMENDATION

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

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The application is recommended for approval.

2.2 The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in principle, in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) loft conversion with rear dormer, the 3m rear extension to facilitate a change of use from Class C3 to Sui Generis (9-Person HMO), with internal alterations works are considered to be acceptable on design and visual amenity grounds, given that the works are not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene or surrounding area.

2.3 Furthermore, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by being visually overbearing or resulting in a significant loss of light or privacy or that the proposal would generate any highway/pedestrian safety concerns. Sufficient off-street parking and amenity space would be retained for current and future occupiers of the site.

2.4 Given all of the above, the proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policies CS1, CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12 and CS29 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004) and the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is situated near the junction of Alexandra Road on the western side of Christchurch Road in Hemel Hempstead. It comprises a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling with a two-storey outrigger projection. The property is also in close proximity to Hemel Hempstead town centre and is positioned on Christchurch Road, where parking restrictions are in place.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The proposal includes a loft conversion with a rear dormer and a 3-meter rear extension to facilitate the change of use from Class C3 to Sui Generis (9-person HMO). Internal alterations will reconfigure the layout to provide living spaces, including bedrooms, shared facilities, and communal areas

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

Appeals (If Any):

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL3

Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Yellow (45.7m)

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)

Residential Character Area: HCA13 SOUTH

Smoke Control Order

Parking Standards: New Zone 3

Town Centre/Local Centre: TOWN & LOCAL CENTRE

Town: Hemel Hempstead

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

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

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

Relevant Policies:

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Place and Movement Planning and Design Guidance for Hertfordshire (2024)

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

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2020)

Planning Obligations (2011)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

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

Principle of Development

9.2 Paragraph 50 of the NPPF establishes that housing applications must be assessed in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policy CS1 reinforces this by designating Hemel Hempstead as the primary location for new housing growth, while Policy CS4 mandates that development be directed to appropriate areas within settlements, actively encouraging residential development in established residential areas.

9.3 Core Strategy Policy CS18 imposes a requirement for new housing developments to deliver a diverse mix of homes, ensuring a range of housing types, sizes, and tenures to meet local needs. Saved Policy 18 of the DBLP further strengthens this expectation by explicitly requiring developments to provide an appropriate mix of dwellings, taking into account the demand for smaller household accommodation, alongside considerations of local character and density.

9.4 Furthermore, while the application proposes a nine-person HMO, the provisions set out in Schedule 2, Part 3, Class L of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended) should be taken into account, recognising that permitted development rights allow for the change of use from a C3 dwellinghouse to a C4 HMO (for up to six unrelated individuals).

9.5 The proposal also includes residential extensions comprising a loft conversion with a rear dormer and a 3m rear extension. In principle, these extensions are acceptable and align with Policy CS4, which supports appropriate residential development within established areas.

9.6 Accordingly, the principle of the proposed conversion and extensions is acceptable in principle, provided that all other material planning considerations, such as impact on character and appearance on the immediate street scene and dwelling house, residential amenity, and parking provision are satisfactorily addressed.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.7 Core Strategy Policies CS11 and CS12 and paragraph 131 of the NPPF highlight the importance of high-quality sustainable design, seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area.

9.8 The proposed conversion to a nine-person HMO would not result in any fundamental changes to the external character or appearance of the dwelling. However, as part of the application, a single-storey 3m rear extension and a full-width box dormer on the rear roof slope are also proposed.

9.9 These alterations are positioned at the rear of the property and will have limited visibility from the public domain. While the rear dormer may be partially visible from the car park on Alexandra Road, its overall impact on the streetscape is minimal.

9.10 The single-storey rear extension is modest in scale, constructed with materials that match the existing dwelling, and designed to integrate seamlessly with the property. Given its sympathetic design and proportionate scale, it is considered an appropriate and unobtrusive addition, raising no concerns in terms of character or appearance.

9.11 Regarding the rear dormer, although it extends almost the full width of the rear roof slope and would typically conflict with the guidance set out in Saved Appendix 7 of the DBLP, which recommends a 1m set-in from the sides, it benefits from a strong fall-back position under permitted development rights (Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the GPDO). This means that a dormer of the same scale could be constructed without the need for planning permission. While the dormer is a substantial addition and not the preferred design approach, its visibility is limited to the car park at the rear and does not impact the primary streetscape. On balance, given its fall-back position under permitted development and its relatively inconspicuous location, the dormer is considered acceptable.

Impact on Residential Amenity

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

Future Occupiers:

9.13 There are no adopted planning policies or guidance for appropriate space standards. However, ensuring a high quality of accommodation is required under the NPPF. The Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard serves as a material consideration and an indicator of whether adequate floor space is provided, particularly for new self-contained dwellings. Additionally, the Council's Licensing department has its own guidance on minimum space standards for HMOs.

9.14 The applicant has proposed a maximum occupancy of nine persons. Given the nine bedrooms, it is assumed they would be single occupancy. All room sizes exceed the minimum requirements for single bedrooms set by relevant guidance—6.52m² under HMO amenity standards and 7.5m² under the Technical Housing Standards—with the smallest bedroom measuring 10m².

9.15 Residents would have access to external amenity space at the rear, which is considered acceptable.

9.16 Overall, the internal space, property layout, and access to a shared garden provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupants.

Impact of Proposed Rear Dormer and Single Storey Rear Extension:

9.17 The proposed rear extension is set away from the boundary, reducing its overall impact on neighbouring properties. While no 45-degree assessments have been provided to measure daylight and sunlight levels for rear windows, any potential impact would be limited to the ground floor, where an existing boundary fence already provides separation between the properties. Additionally, the rear extension falls within permitted development (PD) rights and could be constructed without the need for planning permission, further reinforcing its acceptability.

9.18 In terms of privacy, additional windows will be introduced to the rear as part of the rear dormer construction. However, given the residential nature of the area, some degree of

overlooking is to be expected. Moreover, the dormer also benefits from a PD fall-back, meaning it could be built without requiring planning permission. There is no evidence to suggest that the internal reconfiguration of rooms would result in a material increase in overlooking, as this type of arrangement could equally occur within a standard C3 residential dwelling. Therefore, the impact on privacy is not considered to be significant.

Impact on Neighbourhood Character & Suitability:

9.19 The proposed development is acceptable in principle, as it is located within an established residential area where new housing growth and conversions are encouraged. The site is suitable for residential use, and the extensions, including the loft conversion with a rear dormer and the 3m rear extension, are considered appropriate in this context. Notably, no changes will be made to the front of the property, preserving its existing appearance within the street scene.

9.20 Concerns regarding fire safety and potential overcrowding fall outside the scope of planning considerations. These matters will be assessed separately under HMO licensing and building control regulations, which have their own frameworks to ensure compliance with relevant safety and occupancy standards.

9.21 Similarly, while the proposal includes a nine-person HMO, it is important to note that permitted development rights allow for the conversion of a dwelling to an HMO for up to six occupants without requiring planning permission. Therefore, the increase in occupancy is not, in itself, a reason to refuse the application, if all other planning considerations, such as parking, residential amenity, and overall impact on the character of the area, are appropriately addressed.

Noise, Disturbance & Security Concerns:

9.22 In relation to noise and security concerns, it is important to note that these are not typically regarded as material planning matters and cannot be considered as grounds for refusal. However, in response to the noise concerns raised, appropriate measures have been taken. A noise condition has been specifically requested by the Environmental Community Protection Team at DBC to address potential noise pollution. This condition will ensure that noise levels are monitored and remain within acceptable limits, with regular assessments to ensure compliance. If any disturbances occur, prompt action can be taken to resolve the issue.

9.23 Additionally, as per HMO licensing requirements, landlords are obligated to enforce tenancy agreements that include clauses on noise and antisocial behaviour, further reducing the likelihood of any issues. The modest increase in occupants—from 6 to 9—is unlikely to cause significant disruption, and the enforcement mechanisms in place will ensure that noise levels remain satisfactory and that the character of the area is maintained.

9.24 Regarding the shared access for 7A, while the objections raised are acknowledged, any security concerns arising from this shared access are civil matters and not within the scope of planning considerations. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that the proposed development would increase security risks. The shared access will continue to be used as an access route for residents, and it is unreasonable to impose a condition prohibiting its use. The access is intended for necessary use only, and it is not expected to lead to lingering or any significant disturbances.

Fire Safety & Overcrowding Risks:

9.25 These matters fall outside the scope of planning and will be assessed separately through the HMO licensing process and building control regulations. Both authorities have their own frameworks for evaluating fire safety and occupancy levels to ensure compliance with relevant standards. However, these concerns are not considered planning matters.

Waste Management & Hygiene Concerns:

9.26 While a 9-person HMO will naturally generate more waste, this increase is not considered detrimental as the property will be provided with sufficient bin capacity to accommodate the additional demand. Waste will continue to be managed through the existing council collection services, ensuring no adverse impact on the surrounding area. Furthermore, to address hygiene concerns, the agent has agreed to relocate the bin storage to the shared boundary with a car park instead of a neighbouring property. This adjustment, secured through a planning condition, will help mitigate any potential impact while providing a slight improvement to residential amenity.

Disruptions from Construction:

9.27 Any construction work will be short-term and subject to restrictions on working hours to minimise disruption. The impact will be temporary, and appropriate measures will be taken to manage access and safety during construction.

9.28 The proposal aligns with the NPPF, Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, and saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan, ensuring that the development will not detrimentally impact residential amenity or the character of the area.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.29 The NPPF, along with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and the Parking Standards SPD, seeks to ensure that new developments provide safe, sufficient, and sustainable parking solutions for current and future occupiers. Parking provision should balance the needs of residents while considering the availability of public transport and alternative sustainable travel options.

9.30 Under the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020), HMOs are required to provide 0.5 parking spaces per bedroom. Given that the proposal seeks to establish a nine-person HMO, the development generates a parking requirement of 4.5 spaces. However, the existing property does not benefit from any on-site parking, meaning the proposal would rely entirely on off-street parking.

9.31 Objections to the scheme have raised strong concerns regarding parking availability in the surrounding area, with parking stress being the primary reason for the application being called in to the Development Management Committee (DMC). Christchurch Road and nearby streets operate under a permit parking scheme, with each dwelling entitled to a maximum of three parking permits.

9.32 In light of the shortfall in on-site parking provision, a parking survey was undertaken to assess the existing parking situation and determine the potential impact of the proposal. The survey recorded parking stress levels of 81% and 76% at different times. While these figures indicate a relatively high level of parking demand, it is important to contextualise this data. The permit scheme restricts parking between 8 AM and 8 PM, meaning spaces are predominantly occupied by permit holders rather than unrestricted users. Additionally, pay-and-display parking is available for up to four hours, further regulating turnover and availability. Given these controls, the actual impact of the proposed HMO on long-term parking stress may be less significant given only three permits will be possible to obtain.

9.33 Furthermore, the site is situated in a highly sustainable location. Hemel Hempstead town centre is approximately a 15-minute walk away, providing access to a range of shops, services, and employment opportunities. Public transport links are also readily available, with bus stops located within a 3–4 minute walk of the property, offering regular services to other key

destinations. The accessibility of these transport links reduces the reliance on private car ownership.

9.34 It is also worth noting that the planning policies encourage sustainable development patterns, promoting walking, cycling, and the use of public transport to reduce car dependency. Given the nature of the proposed use as an HMO, it is reasonable to expect a lower car ownership rate among residents compared to a standard dwelling. Additionally, the provision of secure cycle storage could further mitigate parking demand by encouraging active travel.

9.35 While it is acknowledged that parking stress is a concern, the evidence suggests that the impact of the proposed HMO would be manageable within the existing permit-controlled environment. The sustainable location, combined with public transport accessibility and potential alternative travel options, provides a strong justification for the scheme despite the shortfall in on-site parking provision.

Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (CBSAC)

9.36 In accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), consultants Footprint Ecology, assessed the recreational pressures on the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) at Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodlands. The report, published in March 2022, revealed that more action is needed to help protect Ashridge Estate on the Hertfordshire-Buckinghamshire border, and Tring Woodlands, which are under increasing visitor pressure from the borough and surrounding areas.

9.37 In response, the Council's approach to all planning applications involving the construction of new homes has changed, with all development resulting in the net gain of residential development required to provide financial contributions for Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).

9.38 In accordance with the Council's mitigation Strategy, Houses in Multiple Occupancy (HMO's) are 'screened in' as being affected by the Habitat Regulation Assessment regulations. The DBC Strategic Planning Team have confirmed that a 6 person HMO is assessed as constituting 1 dwelling. As the development would accommodate 9 people, it has therefore been confirmed that mitigation is required for 0.5 dwellings.

9.39 A unilateral undertaking is currently being secured to provide mitigation for 0.5 dwellings in accordance with this advice.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.39 xxxx

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The proposed nine-person HMO, along with the loft conversion, rear dormer, and 3m rear extension, is acceptable in principle within an established residential area where such development is encouraged. The external alterations are minimal and largely positioned at the rear, ensuring limited visibility from the public realm. While the dormer does not fully comply with local design guidance, it benefits from a strong fall-back position under permitted development rights and does not significantly impact the streetscape.

10.2 The internal layout space standards, ensuring suitable living conditions for future occupants. The extensions are not considered to have any adverse impact on neighbouring properties in terms of privacy, light, or visual intrusion. Concerns regarding fire safety, waste management, and

overcrowding fall outside the scope of planning and will be addressed through HMO licensing and building control regulations.

10.3 Although on-site parking is not provided, the site benefits from a sustainable location with access to public transport, permit-controlled parking, and alternative travel options, mitigating potential parking stress.

10.4 Overall, the proposal aligns with national and local planning policies, contributing to housing supply while maintaining an acceptable impact on the surrounding area. It is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions addressing noise mitigation, waste management, and compliance with HMO licensing standards.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be GRANTED.

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

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

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

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

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

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

**CHR5 P01 Rev C - Proposed Floor Plans and Roof Plan
CHR5 P02 Rev C - Proposed Vertical Section and Elevations
CR5 P03 Rev D - Proposed Site Block Plan**

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

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

- o all external hard surfaces within the site;**
- o other surfacing materials;**
- o means of enclosure;**
- o minor artefacts and structures (e.g. refuse and bike shed etc.)**

The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

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

5. **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 Policy CS32.

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.
2. Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the County Council website at: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047
3. It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the County Council website at: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavementspavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.
4. It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit compost, dung or other material for dressing land, or any rubbish on a made up carriageway, or any or other debris on a highway to the interruption of any highway user. Section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development and use thereafter are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available by telephoning 0300 1234047

5. 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 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.

6. 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
7. 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.
8. 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 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.

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.

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.

9. 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>

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Houses In Multiple Occupation (DBC)	<p>I have no objection to this application in terms of proposed layout, however I will make the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each unit/bedsit room in the cellar will need an openable window to the outside for the room to be used as a bedroom. Should this not be the case the room will not be permitted to be used as a bedroom on any HMO licence. 2. Both kitchens will need to provide adequate facilities for 9 persons in accordance with Dacorum Borough Council's Amenity Standards.
Affinity Water - Three Valleys Water PLC	<p>Thank you for notification of the above planning application. Planning applications are referred to us where our input on issues relating to water quality or quantity may be required.</p> <p>Water quality</p> <p>You should be aware that the proposed development site is located within an Environment Agency defined groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) corresponding to our Pumping Stations (Marlowes and Piccotts End). This is a public water supply, comprising a number of abstraction boreholes, operated by Affinity Water Ltd.</p> <p>The construction works and operation of the proposed development site should be done in accordance with the relevant British Standards and Best Management Practices, thereby significantly reducing the groundwater pollution risk. It should be noted that the construction works may exacerbate any existing pollution. If any pollution is found at the site then the appropriate monitoring and remediation methods will need to be undertaken.</p> <p>Any works involving excavations below the chalk groundwater table (for example, piling or the implementation of a geothermal open/closed loop system) should be avoided. If these are necessary, a ground investigation should first be carried out to identify appropriate techniques and to avoid displacing any shallow contamination to a greater depth, which could impact the chalk aquifer.</p>

	<p>For further information we refer you to CIRIA Publication C532 "Control of water pollution from construction - guidance for consultants and contractors".</p> <p>Water efficiency Being within a water stressed area, we expect that the development includes water efficient fixtures and fittings. Measures such as rainwater harvesting and grey water recycling help the environment by reducing pressure for abstractions. They also minimise potable water use by reducing the amount of potable water used for washing, cleaning and watering gardens. This in turn reduces the carbon emissions associated with treating this water to a standard suitable for drinking and will help in our efforts to get emissions down in the borough.</p> <p>Infrastructure connections and diversions There are potentially water mains running through or near to part of proposed development site. If the development goes ahead as proposed, the applicant/developer will need to get in contact with our Developer Services Team to discuss asset protection or diversionary measures. This can be done through the My Developments Portal (https://affinitywater.custhelp.com/) or aw_developerservices@custhelp.com.</p> <p>To apply for a new or upgraded connection, please contact our Developer Services Team by going through their My Developments Portal (https://affinitywater.custhelp.com/) or aw_developerservices@custhelp.com. The Team also handle C3 and C4 requests to cost potential water mains diversions. If a water mains plan is required, this can also be obtained by emailing maps@affinitywater.co.uk. Please note that charges may apply.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>Having reviewed the application submission and the Environmental and Community Protection Team records I am able to confirm that there is no objection on the grounds of land contamination. Also, there is no requirement for further contaminated land information to be provided, or for contaminated land planning conditions to be recommended in relation to this application.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p>	<p>Recommendation Notice is given under article 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.</p> <p>HCC as Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Note (AN) / highway informative to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:</p>

AN1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence.

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

AN2) Obstruction of highway: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the County Council website at:

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

AN3) Debris and deposits on the highway: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit compost, dung or other material for dressing land, or any rubbish on a made up carriageway, or any or other debris on a highway to the interruption of any highway user. Section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development and use thereafter are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available by telephoning 0300 1234047

Comments/Analysis

Description of Proposal

Loft conversion and rear extension to facilitate a Change of Use from Class C3 to Sui Generis (9-Person HMO)

Site and Surroundings

Christchurch Road is an unclassified local access route subject to a 30mph speed limit which is highway maintainable at public expense. As per Hertfordshire County Council's new Place and Movement Planning Design Guide (PMPDG), Christchurch Road is classified as a P2/M1.

	<p>The site is located close to the centre of Hemel Hempstead with the top end of Marlowes, the central commercial area of Hemel Hempstead being within 250m of the site; as well as High Street in the old town being a 140m walk from the site. The nearest bus stop to the site is an approximate 230m walk from the site. Therefore, the Highway Authority are satisfied that the site is in a sustainable location and offers options for travel which are not the private car, in line with the principles set out in HCC's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4).</p> <p><i>Access and Parking</i></p> <p>The existing site does not have a vehicular access and the application does not propose to create one. The site is fronted by a footway and double yellow lines with no changes proposed to either of them; therefore, there are no highway works proposed. The parking spaces along Christchurch Road fronting the site are permit holders only, therefore, on street parking is not readily available. HCC would be supportive of a car free development to a HMO due to the sustainable nature of the site and the options for walking and public transport. Additionally, secure cycle parking has been provided, one for each rented room, in the rear garden of the house</p> <p><i>Refuse and Waste Collection</i></p> <p>Manual for Streets Paragraph 6.8.9 states that waste collection vehicles must be able to get within 25m of the bin storage location and residents should not carry waste for more than 30m. These distances are not to be exceeded at the site.</p> <p><i>Emergency Vehicle Access</i></p> <p>In accordance with Manual for Streets Paragraph 6.7, the entirety of a dwelling must be within 45m from the edge of the highway so an emergency vehicle can gain access. This distance is not to be exceeded at the site with the HMO, including extensions, being within 45m of the highway.</p> <p><i>Conclusion</i></p> <p>HCC as Highway Authority has considered the application and are satisfied that the proposal would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highway and therefore, has no objections on highway grounds to this application</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>Environmental Health Pollution Team</p> <p>With reference to the above planning application, please be advised the Environmental Health Pollution Team have no objections or concerns re odour or air quality. However, due to the proposed change of use to an HMO we have concerns regarding transfer of internal noise between</p>

the rooms, especially the games/cinema room located in the cellar. Therefore, the pollution team require the following condition:

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 Policy CS32.

Furthermore, the application has been referred to Private Sector Housing for their consideration due to the proposed change of use and the location of the 2nd kitchen in the loft space. They have confirmed they have no objections or comments.

In addition to the above, I would recommend the application is subject to informatives 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 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 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.

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,

	<p>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 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</p>
--	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
32	9	0	9	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
11 Christchurch Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BX	<p>I don't believe the application we have received for no.5 Christchurch Road is fit for purpose.</p> <p>To have 9 HMOs living in this property will cause a significant amount of noise pollution to a very quiet and family friendly street. I understand the need for housing is desperate, but 9 HMO being housed here will cause a lot of disruption. There will be numerous comings and goings, making the neighbourhood feel unsafe & nosiey. This will also add to social gatherings at the property.</p> <p>the access that they will be using is also shared with other neighbours who only have access to their property via this entrance.</p> <p>The building now having 9 bedrooms and occupants will also cause a fire hazard to the property and surrounding properties, and will affect means of escape.</p> <p>With 9 people moving into the property this will likely add to more cars being used, and parking is already very limited on this road and the next one. This road isn't designed for more multiple cars per household, and will cause safety issues to pedestrians aswell as illegal parking when we already pay for permits and have to park away from home.</p>

	<p>Waste disposal would become a problem with 9 people using the bins provided and putting them through the access and leaving on the main road. This would be a hygiene and h&s issue for everyone in the neighbouring homes.</p> <p>I do strongly recommend that this application is denied as it doesn't fit in with such a lovely and family friendly street.</p>
<p>7 Christchurch Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BX</p>	<p>This proposal for a multi-occ at number 5 is unacceptable. There are many reasons to object to this proposal and many key grounds to consider rejecting if you true value your communities feelings and wellbeing.</p> <p>1) This area is permit parking and already has absolutely no room to hold 9 additional vehicles for 1 property bearing in mind, for each additional car belonging to 1 property, the charge goes up. I work shifts, very strange hour shifts and I never have anywhere to park as it is. Especially now you have made the carpark behind Christchurch Road primarily electric vehicles only. Everyone who is trying to find a space parks there for the night leaving other bays normal cars cannot use free. I have had to park on Broad Street, St Johns Road and Alexandra Road just so I can be close enough to my house but even that is a bit of a trek. Further more, the permit bay area outside the flats are shoddy with tree roots lifting the surface, nothing has been done to fix this and yet you want to add more cars and traffic to an already broken area?</p> <p>2) This property is risking breaching privacy as the alleyway to the right of the property is an access point for a home. Also a shared garden for a maisonette, this alleyway is already broken and damaged and unsafe but its our access point. Having 9 strangers use it at all hours of the day and night is unacceptable. The noise would be horrendous as the echos are bad as it is, the gate isn't secure enough and these are all council issues as the properties are council owned. No.5 being a multi-occ poses a safety risk also as passing an enclosed front door with no additional security. It's going to be unnecessarily loud, disruptive and uncomfortable to live with.</p> <p>3) No.5 is a beautiful period property that in keeping with the area should be a family home. There is already a giant multi-occ right next door that though looks lovely, very clearly isn't what is should have been. They are lucky enough to have a bit of a drive for some cars out of the many properties there but the rest of the vehicles spill out into the permit bays. No.5 is a beautiful house that is better suited to a family home not an over crowded and over priced money making scheme. These proposals don't drive anything but profit into the landlords hands leaving the future tenants just as let down as the rest of the street when the realise there is nowhere to park, the room they rent is just that, a room and there is no space to live. Christchruch Road is not a strip for hotels, rentals and the like. This is a community street where we all know one another and know that 9 strangers living in an awkwardly divided house is unjust and inhumane. For the potential future tenants and the current street occupants.</p> <p>4) There is going to be a massive strain on the existing properties access, parking, church and traffic. When Queensway Road is closed</p>

for accidents or building works, all traffic is diverted through Christchurch road. This is a very common occurrence with Queensway being a high demand main road. The addition of a multi-occ when being built will not only require scaffolding that will encroach on the footpath and other land it shouldn't, but the use of big machinery, HGVs and skips will take up space that just doesn't exist in the lands current form. Should we lose parking or have restricted access because a giant lorry has parked at no.5 or in the bays, access down the 2 way street will be impossible as it normally is. But that will be a long term problem while building is going on. This will impact the church also as the community use the parking out front and around the sides, if there are massive trucks in the way and limited spaces, people won't be able to attend their place of worship.

There are already 3 multi-occ properties in our vicinity, number 1 Christchurch road, the Hightown multi occ on Alexandra Road and number 49 Alexandra Road. All of these properties have a minimum of 7 people living in them with no additional parking and this is evident. There are residents from number 49 Alexandra Road who are parking so far away from their property, basically outside the church or have been on Christchurch Road because there is there any space for them. Parking zone H is completely full and no one is doing anything about it. There are regular traffic jams on the street because of cars parked with it being a 2 way street yet only big enough for 1 car to pass at a time with no dip in points for passing. This forces cars to reverse to the end of the street to let the other pass. Or more of what has been happening lately where drivers mount the pavements and continue driving on the pavement the length of the street till they have pass on coming traffic.

This shouldn't be happening as it is but the addition of 9 rooms, 9 new people and cars, months of building and mess and inaccessibility will put a massive strain on the street.

Finally, no.5 is the adjoining property to mine yet I received no communication about this proposal. Another neighbour informed me of these proposals and even they found out very late into the appeals deadline. We haven't once seen the landlord and they clearly don't know this area very well. This property is beautiful and with its siding onto mine, I know this will cause a nuisance with noise, building and privacy. There is not enough space for 9 people to live in that property which is why all the properties on this street are houses with maximum 5 occupants. 5 being a family not strangers in box rooms. Leave this house to be a house. Don't put unnecessary, unwelcome and unfair strain on our street and please listen to the people voicing their concerns and the strain this will put on the future tenants should this all go ahead.

To whom it may concern,

This proposal for a multi-occ at number 5 is unacceptable. There are many reasons to object to this proposal and many key grounds to consider rejecting if you truly value your communities feelings and wellbeing.

1) This area is permit parking and already has absolutely no room to hold 9 additional vehicles for 1 property bearing in mind, for each additional car belonging to 1 property, the charge goes up. I work shifts,

very strange hour shifts and I never have anywhere to park as it is. Especially now you have made the carpark behind Christchurch Road primarily electric vehicles only. Everyone who is trying to find a space parks there for the night leaving other bays normal cars cannot use free. I have had to park on Broad Street, St Johns Road and Alexandra Road just so I can be close enough to my house but even that is a bit of a trek. Further more, the permit bay area outside the flats are shoddy with tree roots lifting the surface, nothing has been done to fix this and yet you want to add more cars and traffic to an already broken area?

2) This property is risking breaching privacy as the alleyway to the right of the property is an access point for a home. Also a shared garden for a maisonette, this alleyway is already broken and damaged and unsafe but its our access point. Having 9 strangers use it at all hours of the day and night is unacceptable. The noise would be horrendous as the echos are bad as it is, the gate isn't secure enough and these are all council issues as the properties are council owned. No.5 being a multi-occ poses a safety risk also as passing an enclosed front door with no additional security. It's going to be unnecessarily loud, disruptive and uncomfortable to live with.

3) No.5 is a beautiful period property that in keeping with the area should be a family home. There is already a giant multi-occ right next door that though looks lovely, very clearly isn't what it should have been. They are lucky enough to have a bit of a drive for some cars out of the many properties there but the rest of the vehicles spill out into the permit bays. No.5 is a beautiful house that is better suited to a family home not an over crowded and over priced money making scheme. These proposals don't drive anything but profit into the landlords hands leaving the future tenants just as let down as the rest of the street when they realise there is nowhere to park, the room they rent is just that, a room and there is no space to live. Christchurch Road is not a strip for hotels, rentals and the like. This is a community street where we all know one another and know that 9 strangers living in an awkwardly divided house is unjust and inhumane. For the potential future tenants and the current street occupants.

4) There is going to be a massive strain on the existing properties access, parking, church and traffic. When Queensway Road is closed for accidents or building works, all traffic is diverted through Christchurch road. This is a very common occurrence with Queensway being a high demand main road. The addition of a multi-occ when being built will not only require scaffolding that will encroach on the footpath and other land it shouldn't, but the use of big machinery, HGVs and skips will take up space that just doesn't exist in the lands current form. Should we lose parking or have restricted access because a giant lorry has parked at no.5 or in the bays, access down the 2 way street will be impossible as it normally is. But that will be a long term problem while building is going on. This will impact the church also as the community use the parking out front and around the sides, if there are massive trucks in the way and limited spaces, people won't be able to attend their place of worship.

There are already 3 multi-occ properties in our vicinity, number 1 Christchurch road, the Hightown multi occ on Alexandra Road and

	<p>number 49 Alexandra Road. All of these properties have a minimum of 7 people living in them with no additional parking and this is evident. There are residents from number 49 Alexandra Road who are parking so far away from their property, basically outside the church or have been on Christchurch Road because there is there any space for them. Parking zone H is completely full and no one is doing anything about it. There are regular traffic jams on the street because of cars parked with it being a 2 way street yet only big enough for 1 car to pass at a time with no dip in points for passing. This forces cars to reverse to the end of the street to let the other pass. Or more of what has been happening lately where drivers mount the pavements and continue driving on the pavement the length of the street till they have pass on coming traffic.</p> <p>This shouldn't be happening as it is but the addition of 9 rooms, 9 mew people and cars, months of building and mess and inaccessibility will put a massive strain on the street.</p> <p>Finally, no.5 is the adjoining property to mine yet I received no communication about this proposal. Another neighbour informed me of these proposals and even they found out very late into the appeals deadline. We haven't once seen the landlord and they clearly don't know this area very well. This property is beautiful and with its siding onto mine, I know this will cause a nuisance with noise, building and privacy. There is not enough space for 9 people to live in that property which is why all the properties on this street are houses with maximum 5 occupants. 5 being a family not strangers in box rooms. Leave this house to be a house. Don't put unnecessary, unwelcome and unfair strain on our street and please listen to the people voicing their concerns and the strain this will put on the future tenants should this all go ahead.</p>
<p>3 Christchurch Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BX</p>	<p>I write to formally object to the above planning application. While I understand the need for housing, I have several serious concerns regarding the proposed development.</p> <p>Fire Safety A nine-bedroom HMO with multiple occupants increases the risk of fire hazards. There is a restricted means of escape, which affects a significant danger to other neighbours. The property may not be adequately equipped with the necessary fire safety systems, such as appropriate fire exits, alarms, and suppression systems. Given the number of residents, this could pose a significant danger to both the occupants and neighbouring properties, including my own.</p> <p>Further to this, there is an escape route, by means of an alley, between houses 3 and 5, jointly owned by 3 and 3a and is for the sole use of these 2 properties only.</p> <p>Lack of Parking With 9 persons in one property, this will potentially result in more vehicles. The current infrastructure is not designed to accommodate this level of demand, and there is already limited parking available on the street. This would lead to increased congestion, illegal parking and potential safety issues for pedestrians and other road users.</p>

	<p>Loss of Privacy/Light The proposed extension and increase in the number of residents will significantly affect my privacy and safety. With more windows and more residents, there is a potential for increased overlooking into my property, including my garden and living spaces, which will greatly affect my quality of life. The proposed extension and loft conversion will greatly impair my light to my property and back garden.</p> <p>Excessive Noise With frequent comings and goings, will generate a high level of noise, social gatherings and the general daily activities from a large number of people, will disturb the peace and quiet of the neighbourhood particularly during the evening and night. There are elderly residents in the street and this will disturb their peace and greatly affect their safety.</p> <p>Occupancy Density For the size of the property, including the proposed extension, there will be too many people in the property, originally designed for less residents. This will cause many issues and concerns.</p> <p>For these reasons, I strongly believe the proposed development is unsuitable for this residential area and will negatively impact the safety, comfort and quality of life for myself and other neighbours. I respectfully request that the council refuse this application.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerns.</p>
<p>7A Christchurch Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BX</p>	<p>I am writing to oppose to the proposed plan to convert 5 Christchurch Road into a HMO property for 9 people. Please find my reasons stated below:</p> <p>1. Parking As a adjoining neighbour to this property, who pays for a permit to park in the designated H Zone, I would like to inform you of the parking difficulties I already experience in the area. Firstly, I would consider Christchurch Road to regularly reach the maximum amount of cars that can possibly park here. I regularly do not manage to park close to my home, often having to park on other streets such as Alexander Road or Broad Street. I work irregular hours, evenings and weekends, and this is the case at all times of the week. Car's in the area often increase at weekends due to attendee's of the church also parking on Christchurch Road/Alexander Road, where it is possible to pay for parking. This has increased since the small car park, at the rear of Christchurch Road has recently been converted to be used for electric vehicles, reducing the amount of pay and display parking in the area, resulting in less spaces available for residents who pay for permits to park in this zone. Additionally, area's of the road which may appear vacant to park, are unused due to the quality of the road surface, but also damage that occurs to cars because of tree debris and an excessive amount of bird faeces. Damage to my car has occurred because of this mess, which as I said is excessive. Residents who live in the middle of the street do not use this point of parking, regularly parking at either end or on other side roads because the damage to cars, the constant mess that has to be cleared from cars and the risk of falling branches/debris is so</p>

constant. Although the plan for this property states 4.5 cars, a 9 bedroom property is proposed. Even if the minimum amount of car's were added to this street it would be too much, and assuming every resident has a car it would cause a large impact to those already living on the road, paying for permits, and already struggling to park in the area, at any point in the week.

2. Personal Safety

a)As mentioned above, I live in the property next door to the proposed plan. Unlike other houses on the street, my only point of access to my property is situated down the alleyway that adjoins these two houses. I already find the access to my property unnerving, especially in winter, or late at night, due to its isolation, lack of light and singular access. I believe the proposed plan, with its 9 tenant application, adds a great risk to my personal safety, not only due to the amount of individuals residing in the property, but from visitors, the general increased use of the alley (my single point of access to my home), the increased knowledge of my access point (to residents, their social visitors, tradesmen, and others, due to lack of care such as gate being left open constantly, which is really the only thing that makes me feel somewhat safe and hidden from potential danger). I really would like to stress to those making the decision about this plan, this is my only access point to my property and this factor is something that has been causing me quite a lot of anxiety already. I know the previous tenant left this property due to feeling unsafe and vulnerable due to the properties isolated access. For the planned proposal to go ahead, it presents to me a real risk to my personal safety, with the many different individuals, their social visitors and the likes that would become aware, and have access to, my home's off street, single point of access.

b) Risk of fire hazards/Limited emergency escape access

As mentioned in the previous point, I only have one exit route from my property. Even if exiting through the garden, the only exit from my property in case of emergency is down the alleyway which sits between my property and the proposed property, 5 Christchurch Road. I believe the increased risk of fires, due to a second kitchen being installed to accommodate the needs of 9 individuals in a terraced house, but also the increased risk of fire due to the amount of people residing in one property is dangerous, for myself, other neighbours and other properties in the area. Again, I would like to stress I have one point of access to my property which sits in the alleyway off street, between 5 and 7 Christchurch Road. I believe this is another factor which should be taken seriously by those deciding on the outcome of these plans.

3. General dislike of proposal/Out of keeping with the character of area

I understand homes have to be built for people to live in, but the proposed property is a beautiful Victorian Terraced house, with a large back garden that would make a lovely home for the right family. Living on this street for the last year, I can honestly say I feel lucky to have found myself on such a lovely street with well looked after homes and friendly neighbours. Other than the property I live in, which is a

maisonette with one upstairs neighbour, and a small set of flats further up the road, all other homes on this street are occupied by families, long time residents and young couples. Communities such as these are at risk due to developments such as HMO's, which often bring poorly kept or maintained properties, high turnover of tenants, increased public nuisance, waste problems, lack of care for the neighbourhood, property or surrounding area as well as issues such as parking problems, as mentioned above. I believe the proposed plan, not only for a HMO, but for a 9 person occupancy, not only runs these risks to the local area and community found on Christchurch Road, but also to the future tenants of 5 Christchurch Road. Converting a family home, with living rooms and space to live into a HMO for 9 people, in my opinion, is distasteful, excessive, greedy and unfair on the future tenants and current residents on Christchurch Road. I'm sure rent for a single room, in an area such as Hemel Hempstead is already at an all time high, and I question the standard of living that is on offer for the proposed future tenants. Personally, I believe cramming 9 people into one home is unreasonable, and perpetuating and condoning a style of accommodation that should be deemed unfair, unreasonable and unacceptable in this day and age.

4. Noise nuisance

As I have mentioned, I am the adjoining neighbour to the proposed property. I believe the proposed plans risk an unsuitable and unfair risk of peace to myself, and other direct neighbours due to the high level of tenants suggested in this plan. Not only from general access to the property, but from social gatherings, of many different people, working and living at all times of day. My property shares access to the proposed properties back garden, which passes my only access to my home. To gain this access, use of an alleyway, and gate which opens onto the street is used, and my concerns are that this access, possibly at all times of day will cause excess disturbance to myself in my property. The proposed plans also state refuse bins will be stored in the back garden, as will a bike shed in order to "combat the parking issue". This means all bikes, bins, and general access to the garden in order to fulfill the councils needs, will directly affect, and disturb my own. Not to mention the possible risk to my only access, and fire exit, being blocked due to any of the above mentioned items, their proper storage and the regular, weekly or daily movement in order for them to be used/collected by the many people living in the property.

5. Loss of privacy/Loss of Light/Pests

I consider myself very lucky to have a back garden, and enjoy using it regularly. My garden gets afternoon light in the summer, which I make the most of and enjoy spending time in gardening and relaxing. The proposed plans risk not only blocking the only bit of sun I get in my garden in the summer months, but will have a detrimental affect on the amount of privacy I currently have due to the additional rooms and excessive amount of tenants. I would also like to add, that I personally do not believe keeping 6+ bins in a back garden, containing all manner of waste from a HMO property to be particularly safe or possibly hygenic, increasing the risk of pests such as rats to the area, and my garden. I know we already have many foxes in the area, I see them up

	<p>and down the street and in and out of bins when I come home from work, so I question how increasing the amount of waste in an already busy area is deemed safe. I also appreciate wildlife in my back garden, I have many birds, squirrels, and I suspect hedgehogs that visit, so again question how keeping this many bins housing the waste of 9 people is not going to have an affect on welcome wildlife, but also increase the population and mess caused by unwelcome wildlife within the area.</p> <p>Other points of opposition:</p> <p>a)Home access/parking access during works.</p> <p>The proposed plans, and the length of time they may take to complete, propose risks of blocks of access to my property, the street and residents current ability to park in the area. Large lorries/skips/work vans potentially block access for two way moving traffic, in an already heavily parked street where residents struggle to park near their homes. Additionally, waste disposal from within the property may block access to the pavement due to the large amount of bins.</p> <p>I would like to add, whatever the outcome of these plans, or future plans proposed to the property, than conditions should be made regarding the use of the alleyway between my home and 5 Christchurch Road. As this is my only access to my home, only way of taking out my garden waste, and my only fire exit, I would like it to be confirmed, in writing to myself and the occupant of 7 Christchurch Road who also shares this as their access point to their garden, that this area should not be blocked by any type of building work or materials, used as a dry storage area, and should be kept clean and tidy by those carrying out any works on the property, or future tenants, to enable not only safe access to my property and garden, but also safe exit for myself in the case of an emergency.</p> <p>I appreciate the consideration given to my concerns regarding this proposal and my objections to the above application regarding this property and thank you in advance for your time and help with this matter.</p>
<p>3A Christchurch Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BX</p>	<p>I have received the letter re planning application for no 5 Christchurch Road. I am not in support of this application, as a 9 person HMO is not appropriate or in character with this street (Christchurch Road). A HMO would not make the area feel as safe and quiet as it has been since I have lived here. The parking would become a nightmare, whereas at the moment we get by. How would a 9 person HMO evacuate safely in fire a evacuation? The homes on this street are for families and small homes, not a HMO or HMO environment. Also, waste disposal would not be safe or hygienic as the pathway is too small for so many wheelie bins to accommodate a 9 person HMO. To classify this property as a HMO, I don't feel is the correct categorisation. The property is not safe as a HMO or appropriate for the number of persons. Even if the property was extended, the sizing is still not correct and the boundary and surrounding properties would suffer due to suitability for many reasons e.g. access and egress, Health and Safety and noise and nuisance. At the moment the road is quiet and I feel safe, a HMO would not make me feel safe in my own home. I hope my response will be read and</p>

	<p>taken seriously as this application has greatly concerned me as it has with other neighbours.</p>
<p>41 Christchurch Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BX</p>	<p>I object to this application. Having sought professional advice on the matter it has been confirmed that the application meets neither the technical requirements for such a development as listed below, or is in keeping with adopted and government policy. This is particularly relevant to the character of the area and a shared concern for the local community who also object.</p> <p>Scheme noncompliance: "The minimum width for an HMO kitchen is 1.8 meters at its narrowest point." The proposed first floor kitchen is 1.484 meters along its entire length and contrary to the requirements. Further the space is unusable providing on 884mm of usable width beyond the kitchen cupboards - this does not provide sufficient room for passing or escape. A question must be raised also of the suitability of a first floor corridor kitchen in an HMO. Hertfordshire fire brigades assessment must be of relevance in determination of this application.</p> <p>Moving onto the Design & access statement with its many uncorrected spelling mistakes which I find as evidence of an unconsidered scheme that has been thrown together by chancing developers, not really expecting to obtain permission for such a totally erroneous and out of context proposal in such a location. It incorrectly states that this is a midterrace house. It is not. It is a semidetached single dwellinghouse, by its character unsuitable to be a HMO.</p> <p>The document states "it is not a locally or statutorily listed building and (sic) but is affected by Article 4 Direction 'Change of use from Residential Dwelling House (C3) to House in Multiple Occupation (C4)'." This renders the following paragraph referring to permitted development, obsolete. There is no permitted development in this situation. Indeed the reason for the existence of the C4HMO legislation is precisely to prevent this kind of unacceptable development.</p> <p>A long list of "planning policies considered" is provided in the document. The opposite seems to be the case.</p> <p>Impact on amenity; The documentation states "It is considered that all of the proposed habitable spaces are expected to largely receive an acceptable level of daylight/ sunlight." Considered by whom? Largely complying or actually not complying? The required evidence is not in the application. A change of use requires that all habitable rooms have minimum standards of natural light. There is no demonstration of this for any rooms - no daylight study is in the application. Further, it will be impossible to meet this requirement as the proposed 'communal space' in the basement has no windows! The proposal does not comply with policy requirements and must be refused.</p> <p>Transport: The proposal in no way meets the requirements for HMO. The stated travel times are a fiction. The site has a PTAL rating of 1b - which indicates 'extremely poor access to the location by public transport' -</p>

	<p>one away from the worst possible rating. In relation to this the supposition that no additional cars will be owned by the residents (how else are people going to travel if there is no public transport?) or that additional traffic from visitors be generated is farcical. The proposal does not comply with policy requirements and must be refused.</p> <p>Impact on neighbouring amenity (not addressed in the document): In mitigation for not providing any parking it is proposed to install 9 bike spaces in the already incredibly small external amenity space. 9 bikes using the private access of the neighbouring property. Let alone the additional comings and goings of the expected residents. Who will move and where will the additional 6 large recycling bins go? This alone will undoubtedly impose a negative and unacceptable burden on the adjoining property. This is a house in an area of family homes! The proposal does not comply with policy requirements and must be refused.</p> <p>In conclusion: The document states "The proposal overall is considered to be acceptable and there would be no unacceptable impacts to adjacent properties or to the character of the area/appearance of the existing building. It is, therefore, our understanding that planning permission should be granted." This is the exact opposite of the truth and I trust the officers and committee see this application for what it is and support the policy framework, submission requirements and real concern of the united local community in rejection of this and any subsequent applications of this kind.</p>
<p>21 Christchurch Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BX</p>	<p>We agree with all the objections already raised.</p> <p>The biggest concern for us is the parking situation on Christchurch Road / Alexandra Road in permit zone H. We already often have to park away from our road due to lack of space, which is not ideal with a young child. Furthermore, as has been mentioned, much of the existing parking space on Christchurch Road is in poor condition due to the overhanging trees. The roots are pulling up the tarmac and bird droppings / tree sap / falling branches etc. already cause issue. A 9-person HMO has the potential to significantly increase the issues we already face regarding parking, even if only a few of the occupants had a vehicle.</p> <p>The majority of residents on this street are young families, young couples or retirees, and a development of this size is likely to increase noise nuisance on what is currently a very quiet street.</p>
<p>17 Christchurch Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BX</p>	<p>I am writing to formally object to the planning application for the proposed conversion of 5 Christchurch Road into a nine-person house in multiple occupation (HMO). While I understand the importance of providing diverse housing options, I have significant concerns regarding the impact this development will have on our community.</p> <p>Parking and Traffic Concerns The primary issue I wish to highlight is the severe parking strain this proposal will create. The anticipated occupancy of nine residents suggests multiple vehicles, which would significantly increase demand</p>

	<p>for parking on Christchurch Road. However, our road is already grappling with limited parking availability, exacerbated by several large trees whose roots have pushed up through the surface, reducing the usable space for vehicles. This situation leaves little room for additional cars, thus creating Community Tensions: As parking becomes scarcer, disputes among residents over available spaces may arise, leading to a strained community atmosphere. This kind of conflict can erode the sense of neighbourliness that we currently enjoy.</p> <p>Community Impact</p> <p>Beyond parking, I am also concerned about how the conversion to a large HMO would alter the character of our neighbourhood. Our community is primarily residential and family-oriented, and the introduction of a high-density living arrangement could disrupt this balance.</p> <p>The influx of new residents may also lead to increased noise levels and disturbances, particularly during evenings and weekends. The nature of shared living arrangements often results in a higher turnover of guests and social gatherings, which can disrupt the peace and quiet that many of us value in our homes.</p> <p>Overcrowding and Living Conditions</p> <p>The proposed conversion raises concerns about overcrowding and the adequacy of living conditions for future residents. A nine-person household in a single dwelling may not provide sufficient space for residents to live comfortably. Overcrowding can lead to numerous health and wellbeing issues, including stress and mental health concerns. It is crucial that living arrangements support the wellbeing of residents, which is unlikely to be achieved in such a densely populated setting.</p> <p>Precedent for Future Developments</p> <p>Finally, approving this application could set a concerning precedent for similar developments in our area. It may encourage further conversions of residential properties into large HMOs, which could fundamentally change the character of our neighbourhood. The risk of overdevelopment must be taken seriously, as it threatens to erode the qualities that make our community an attractive place to live.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly urge the planning committee to consider the profound implications of approving this application on the local community. The significant strain on parking, coupled with the limitations of our road due to large trees and raised roots, makes this proposal unsuitable for our community.</p>
<p>47 Christchurch Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BX</p>	<p>I object to this application.</p> <p>As raised by other local residents, it is clear that this application fails to meet the technical requirements for a C4HMO development and is also not in keeping with adopted and government policy.</p> <p>It is also clear that the proposal takes no account of the negative impact such a development would have on the character of the area. It is important context that Christchurch Road is comprised of mostly small-medium family homes, housing couples or families. There are some properties with off road parking but most others rely on on-street parking. A HMO of this size is out of keeping with the area and would</p>

undoubtedly disrupt the character of the area and the living conditions of the current residents.

Design proposal issues:

As listed by other residents concerns, there are a number of design noncompliances. These include:

- Inadequate daylight availability to the rooms (indeed two bedroom units and the cinema / communal room in the basement receive zero natural light - a point ignored by the consultee in the application)
- Below minimum dimension requirements in the kitchen design on the second floor. Aside from contravening agreed guidance, this would also cause a risk in the case of an emergency / fire evacuation, so is unsafe.

- The expectation of residents to use the side access every day to move bicycles and bins in and out of the rear garden area would inevitably cause constant disturbance to the neighbouring properties.

The proposal is littered with inaccuracies (e.g. stating the property is mid-terrace when it is end of terrace / the local public transport proximities) and spelling errors. This suggests a substandard approach to the preparation of the proposal and the critical detail considerations within it. If this substandard approach taken by the consultee would also be used when managing a HMO, there would certainly then be elevated concerns over the impact of noise, disturbance, lack of adequate upkeep and the environmental impact of the property on the local area. It shows a concerning lack of attention to detail / lack of seriousness to their approach.

Transport and parking:

The PTAL rating of 1b (indicating a very low availability of public transport links) should indicate that there is a very high chance that the HMO residents will have to rely on cars as personal transport (this is true of most current residents on Christchurch Road) but the application makes an erroneous assumption that all residents of the proposed HMO will travel by bicycle / by foot. There would be up to 9 new vehicles looking to park on a road that is already restricted and in poor condition due to badly managed trees causing road and pavement damage. The additional traffic from these residents would also have a negative noise and air pollution effect on Christchurch Road. This has not been considered correctly as the assumptions used in the proposal are false.

Overall the proposal does not meet the agreed standards required of such a development, and so must be rejected.

In conclusion:

It is clear from the amount of noncompliance points and misinformation in the assumptions on which the application is based, that this proposal must be rejected, in accordance with the agreed policy.

The significant negative impact that such a proposal would have on the character and appearance of Christchurch Road must also be considered and I would hope the committee will see that this also must lead them to reject this proposal and any other similar proposal for this property to be considered as a C4HMO.

	I appreciate your consideration of this objection.
--	--