

24/01570/FUL

Nash House-Conversion of basement

NMPC strongly object to this revised application. We have considered the revised application, and our previous objections remain, lack of parking provision, the inappropriate siting of the bin stores for the whole property next to the windows of the proposed habitable space (**contrary to the statement is 1.3.3 of the submitted planning statement**) and in addition we have concerns regarding the provision of a community space.

We have previously raised objections relating to the inadequate provision of parking and the inadequate provision of appropriate disabled bays. We note the comments from HCC as consultee who have also raised the issue regarding the disabled parking bays.

We would also like to comment again on the **active marketing of 'allocated' parking spaces** having an impact on the number required for this proposal to comply with the DBC parking standards (**contrary to the statement 1.3.4 of the submitted planning statement**). All spaces on site are clearly marked with property numbers and addresses.

We reiterate-the entirety of the parking on this site has been actively marketed as allocated thus affecting the parking provision required-please see the advert below for the property as included in the photos in the agent's summary

Exclusively to Lloyd Lettings, this extremely modern one bedroom apartment is located within the popular location of Nash Mills. Set on the second floor this recently refurbished apartment benefits from, entrance hall, luxury open planned kitchen with appliances, modern living area, Jack & Jill bathroom & double bedroom with storage facilities.

Other benefits include, underfloor heating, high ceiling and allocated parking.

Walking distance to Apsley station! Available now!

With the extreme level of on street parking stress at this location and neighbouring streets, the prohibition of on street parking in the location and the yellow lines on the nearest streets for public parking we raise this issue again. With fully allocated spaces, no visitor parking, no disabled parking provision and a lack of sufficient parking for 11 dwellings, some of which have more than 1 occupancy we feel the parking standards are still not adequately met. On our calculations it appears that there is a deficit of 5.7 spaces (if the SPD requirement of 20% uplift for the provision of visitor's spaces for developments with over 10 dwellings with fully allocated spaces becomes applicable). If this uplift isn't applicable there still remains a deficit of 2.75 spaces with no known adaptation allowance for any possible disabled space requirements.

NMPC also question the option for disabled bay provision and how this would work in practical terms as all spaces are allocated. Does an additional separate bay need to be included or should ALL spaces be larger to accommodate the accessibility requirements?

It should be noted at this point that NMPC have asked for building conditions to be imposed on Application 24/01467/FUL to mitigate the additional future stress that may be caused by this proposal being reverted back to two dwelling resulting in a total of 12 dwellings at this location.

Furthermore, we would like to draw attention to the importance of the value of the community space within this development. Community space underpinned the original application for the conversion of this significant heritage asset within the parish. The house was of significant historical importance and unfortunately, during the development works was not treated with the care and respect it should have been.

To mitigate the loss of this asset to housing it was always specified that there was to be an appropriate community space to be a benefit to the community of Nash Mills. This was also to include heritage noticeboards charting the history of the area. It was never contingent on the financial viability of the development.

In every single iteration of the planning history for this property (as detailed in the planning statement submitted by the agent), community use has been a cornerstone. There is no apparent reasoning to remove this obligation as the current developer took on this project with full, documented transparency of that criteria.

NMPC feel that the constant reapplication and appeals process could be perceived as disingenuous and acting in the hope that in time those involved with the original case would not have the history of the building in mind and that the persistence would result in a financial gain that is only benefitting any developer of the site. We also have concerns that the removal of the community space will not only provide a financial gain but is being used as a mechanism for circumnavigating the SPD parking provisions.

With the number of developments recently approved within Dacorum, the recently approved, nearby Rectory farm development and the pending Hemel Garden Community project it seems incongruous to believe that 2 new flats, which are not allocated for affordable housing would do anything to alleviate any perceived 'lack of housing supply'. We feel that the statement at 1.3.2 is misleading.

We note the comments at 2.6.2 relating to public transport and would like the developer to evidence that such a regular bus service runs on the route detailed as there does not appear to be such a service in operation. It appears that the 501 now runs on Sundays only. [Bus Routes around Hemel Hempstead \(intalink.org.uk\)](https://www.intalink.org.uk)

NMPC would respectfully urge DBC as LPA to determine this application with all of the relevant history in mind, the previous comments of His Majesty's Planning Inspectorate and the previous comments from NMPC. The original application for the site was approved in 2010 and 14 years later we still do not have the history boards that were promised. We have missed more than one generation of children who could have been educated about the importance of the area in which they live.

NMPC 30/7/2024