

---

**PLANNING COMMITTEE****MINUTES**

of the Planning Committee meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, on 15 August 2019 from 7.30pm to 9.10pm

Councillors present:

Sarah Nelmes (Chairman)

Sara Bedford

David Raw (sub for Cllr Marilyn Butler)

Matthew Bedford (sub for Cllr Steve Drury)

Stephen King

Peter Getkahn

Keith Martin (Vice-Chairman)

Raj Khiroya

Chris Lloyd

Debbie Morris

Michael Revan

Also in attendance Councillors Joanna Clemens and Phil Williams, Batchworth Community Councillors Diana Barber and Francois Neckar and Chorleywood Parish Councillor Harry Davis.

Officers: Adam Ralton, Claire Westwood, David Heighton, Sarah Haythorpe and Jo Welton

**PC 31/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Marilyn Butler and Councillor Steve Drury, appointed named substitutes Councillor's David Raw and Matthew Bedford.

**PC 32/19 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 18 July 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman.

**PC 33/19 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS**

None received.

**PC 34/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Sarah Nelmes read out the following statement to the Committee:

"All Members are reminded that they should come to meetings with an open mind and be able to demonstrate that they are open minded. You should only come to your decision after due consideration of all the information provided, whether by planning officers in the introduction, by applicants/agents, by objectors or by fellow Councillors. The Committee Report in itself is not the sole piece of information to be considered. Prepared speeches to be read out are not a good idea. They might suggest that you have already firmly made up your mind about an application before hearing any additional information provided on the night and they will not take account of information provided on the night. You must always avoid giving the impression of having firmly made up your

mind in advance no matter that you might be pre-disposed to a view.”

The Chairman declared that all the Liberal Democrat Councillors on the Committee had non-pecuniary interests in item 11 (19/1183/FUL – Loft conversion including front dormer window and rear rooflights, alterations to the roof form of the existing two storey rear projection, single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration at 17 ADRIAN ROAD, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WD5 0AG.) as the Agent was a Liberal Democrat Councillor.

**PC 35/19 19/0829/FUL - Four storey side extension to north west of existing building to provide 76 additional bedrooms, leisure and conference facilities, associated landscaping, and provision of additional car parking spaces throughout the site at THE GROVE, GROVE MILL LANE, GROVE MILL, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 4TG**

**19/0831/LBC - Four storey side extension to north west of existing building to provide 76 additional bedrooms, leisure and conference facilities, associated landscaping, and provision of additional car parking spaces throughout the site at THE GROVE, GROVE MILL LANE, GROVE MILL, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 4TG**

The Planning Officer reported that the Lead Local Flood Authority had responded following their receipt of additional information in respect of drainage. They had confirmed that they had no objections to the proposed development subject to a condition being attached requiring more details in respect of a surface water drainage scheme to be submitted, detailing the outcome of infiltration tests and detailed drawings of drainage features.

Councillor Chris Lloyd asked for clarification on parking. If the Committee were minded to grant permission could Officers clarify the parking spaces.

The Planning Officer explained that whilst there was only one additional car parking space with this development as it stands now it does not have car parking to comply with the local plan standards. When the hotel was granted planning permission it was acknowledged that whilst there was various different uses lots of the trips were often combined so it was considered that you didn't need separate car parking for the hotel, conference facilities and restaurant. Whilst there was no additional car parking it was considered that there was sufficient parking on site and with the car parking management plans it would formalise how the on site parking would be managed which Officers considered acceptable.

With that response Councillor Chris Lloyd was happy to move the recommendation that planning permission be granted for application **19/0829/FUL** subject to conditions with an additional condition on drainage.

Councillor Debbie Morris commented that on the car parking she had been slightly concerned but the whole purpose of the development was to make the hotel more family friendly and it occurred to her that the more families that visit they would use more bedrooms but would not bring more vehicles. She was happy to second the recommendation.

On being put to the Committee the motion for application (**19/0829/FUL**) was declared CARRIED by the Chairman the voting being unanimous.

Councillor Chris Lloyd, seconded by Councillor Debbie Morris moved the recommendation that LBC be granted for application 19/0831/LBC.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes said she liked the green wall design and asked if there was a condition included which would maintain the green wall. The Planning Officer said

Condition C7 stated that before the building was brought into use a full maintenance schedule for the proposed living/green wall should be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Officers would expect that to take into account the long term vision of maintaining the green wall.

On being put to the Committee the motion for application (**19/08231 LBC**) was declared CARRIED by the Chairman the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

Planning application 19/0829/FUL: That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendations and conditions as set out in the report with an additional condition to be added requiring additional drainage information to be submitted. The wording of the condition to be:

Condition:

No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage strategy should demonstrate the surface water run-off generated up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% for climate change critical storm will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event. The scheme shall also include:

1. Infiltration tests carried out in accordance with BRE Digest 365 at the location and depth of the proposed soakaways.
2. Infiltration tests carried out in accordance with BRE Digest 365 at the location and depth of the proposed grasscrete (CellPave) car parking.
3. If infiltration cannot be achieved for the site the applicant will need to propose an alternative surface water discharge mechanism with all appropriate approvals.
4. If a feasible infiltration rate cannot be achieved for the grasscrete car parking, an alternative method of surface water discharge for the car parking such as permeable paving and connecting to a soakaway will be needed.
5. Detailed surface water calculations to reflect the measured infiltration rate for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.
6. Detailed engineering drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs.
7. Final detailed management plan to include arrangements for adoption and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The development shall thereafter be implemented and maintained in accordance with the details as approved by this condition.

Reason: This pre-commencement condition is required at the request of the Lead Local Flood Authority to prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of and disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policies CP1, CP8 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

**Listed Building Consent application 19/0831/LBC:** That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendations and conditions as set out in the report.

PC 36/19

**19/0990/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 7 apartments with basement parking at 34 EASTBURY AVENUE, NORTHWOOD, HA6 3LN**

The Planning Officer reported that since the Committee report was published, the applicant had submitted additional information in the form of a further bat survey. Herts Ecology were consulted and Officers were awaiting a response.

Councillor Debbie Morris said if an application can be approved when it fails to comply with all our standards and guidelines can it equally be refused if it complied with some of our standards and guidelines. The application had sufficient parking spaces but she had concerns about the nature of the parking configuration. The Planning Officer said there was adequate parking spaces being provided and therefore Officers did not think they would be able to defend at appeal based on the number. If there was concerns with usability of the spaces that was a consideration although Members would need to be satisfied that there was a strong case that there was harm that resulted from the lack of usability and that it could be demonstrated.

Officers displayed the basement parking plan on the screens. Councillor Debbie Morris said that 6/7 of the apartments had tandem parking. She knew there was tandem parking arrangements in neighbouring blocks but wondered if Officers could confirm this was the highest percentage known to them and was considerably higher than the other blocks in the vicinity. The Planning Officer confirmed this was correct.

Councillor Debbie Morris said as a Ward Councillor she was aware of the demographics of those who lived in these apartments which tended to be people from an older generation who were downsizing. She had concerns that the size of the vehicles were increasing but the proposed parking space sizes were just about compliant with our current standards. She was aware that these standards were being reviewed. When you have more elderly people with reduced mobility trying to squeeze in and out of their cars when the doors wont open wide enough to get out that was a problem and was likely to discourage residents from parking in the spaces. She believed that the demographic of the residents would generally be retirees who would not be going out in the morning and coming back at night but would have more frequent car movements during the day for shopping errands, medical appointments and visiting friends therefore it was important to be able to access their parking spaces easily and not to have to draw up some complicated schedule for when they would be exiting and returning to the property. This would also probably lead to more people parking on the road due to the number of vehicle movements. She was very concerned that the extent of tandem parking in this type of development although it was compliant with our standards it was not workable for the sort of people that were going to be living here and the type of vehicles they would be driving. As a matter of interest a Range Rover was 2.22 metres wide with the mirrors unfolded and a VW Golf was 2.03 metres wide with the mirrors unfolded which if you have a 2.4 metre parking bay does not leave a lot of room.

The Planning Officer responded that the number of parking spaces exceeded the standards in terms of their number and met or exceeded current standards in terms of their size. There maybe an emerging new guidance document but it was emerging at this stage. Officers could not speculate on who might be an occupier. If future occupiers did not find the layout acceptable they could choose not to purchase a flat. Officers noted the concerns of Members but felt that the layout worked and it had been demonstrated in the traffic diagrams. Subject to the management plan they found the scheme to be acceptable for the reasons set out in the report.

Councillor Sara Bedford said the Committee could not refuse an application on who they think might live in the properties and the fact that they may all drive Range Rovers. The application complied with our parking standards. In the road where she lived it had tandem parking and that was what most semi-detached houses had and everyone managed to work with this without having to make complicated arrangements for parking. She was not happy that the developer could not provide an affordable housing contribution due to it not being viable but could now afford to put more car parking spaces in which was expensive (a six figure sum) to provide a

basement but no contribution towards affordable housing which this District really needed. However she could not see any way the Committee could refuse the application on the grounds of parking, who may live there and what car they might drive and the applicant could be awarded costs at an appeal.

Councillor Matthew Bedford stated that people would know exactly what the parking arrangements were before buying a property and would be able to make their own assessment of whether to purchase a property or not and would be able to decide what type of vehicle would fit in the spaces as do people who have small garages. He did not see this as a problem and moved the recommendation that Planning Permission be Granted subject to conditions.

Councillor Sara Bedford said at Paragraph 7.7.7 in the report it pointed that there was enough room for vehicles to safely wait while there was movement of other vehicles.

Councillor Debbie Morris said in relation to parking yes people would buy a property and know the parking arrangements but equally they would see in certain parts of the road that there was unrestricted parking and thereby this would add to the existing parking pressures. When other flats were built there would be no parking available in the road. She had not suggested there was no waiting room. Other concerns she had related to the close proximity of No.1 The Marlins and whether the distance was appropriate in relation to Council policy. On the back to back distances the standard required 28 metres but we have back to flank here, with 13 metres to the rear boundary and an unknown distance between the rear of the proposed development and the rear garden of No.1 The Marlin. Could Officers advise what that distance was.

The Planning Officer advised it was appropriate within Council policy. The distance from the proposed development and the rear garden of No.1 The Marlins would be 24.5 metres.

Councillor Debbie Morris noted the 24.5 metres but the back to back distances should be 28 metres for a two storey block and this was a four storey block. The Planning Officer said they were not suggesting this complies with the 28 metre figure. The 28 metre figure was for back to back distances. As Councillor Morris had identified this was a back to flank distance so the policy was not directly applicable and Officers felt for the reasons set out in the report the relationship was acceptable.

Councillor Debbie Morris said presumably the back to back distances were there to protect peoples privacy and to prevent overlooking. There was a rear garden which was 24/25 metres away from the balconies which were unscreened in at least one instance (at the rear) therefore the garden was liable to be overlooked. The 28 metre separation distance back to back was for 2 storeys and was supposed to be larger for greater distances. Therefore the rear garden of No1 The Marlins was at considerable risk of overlooking.

In accordance with Council procedure 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Officer showed a picture of No.1 The Marlins which demonstrated that the main garden was to the rear of the house and the large detached garage was to the side. There was a little bit of land behind the garage but it was a much smaller area and was not the main part of the garden. The site in question was to the left of that.

Local Ward Councillor Joanna Clemens had concerns regarding the parking arrangements. Applications kept being accepted for these types of apartment blocks which did not provide the appropriate parking. She did not like the style or building or design which was not in keeping with the arts and craft style of houses in the road.

Community Councillor Diana Barber said the scale of the development was excessive in the streetscene and the architectural style was not in keeping. She had concerns about the tandem parking although it complied with Council policy. There was only one allocated disabled parking space which was a dual purpose space and seemed to be completely inadequate given the changing demographic environment of the community with more elderly residents.

Councillor Peter Getkhan said the site was not in the Conservation Area and there was no restriction on architectural styles which was confirmed by the Planning Officer.

Councillor Debbie Morris said that the speaker had said they would be willing to consider obscure glazing on the lower balconies although she was unaware of the current arrangements for the glazing on the balconies/privacy screening and how this could be increased. With regards to the finish there were two similar designed buildings in the road with a white render finish but after a period of time they appeared more green than white. If this application was given approval there should be a strong maintenance condition incorporated to make sure the white render of the building stayed that way.

Councillor David Raw said after listening to all the comments he felt that the development was out of character. Councillor Sarah Nemes pointed out that it was not in a Conservation Area.

The Planning Officer said there was screening to the east flank but there was no obscure screening elsewhere. There was no privacy screens on the rear elevation. Often you would have privacy screens on the side, these would be higher and would be obscure glazed and of particular height. The balcony screens at the back were waist height so whilst you could make them obscure glazed they were not of such a height that it would stop you from seeing out. Officers felt that the relationship was such that there was no necessity for them. A condition could certainly be added with regard to building maintenance to the white render.

Councillor Sarah Nemes moved that Planning Permission be granted with an additional condition with regard to the maintenance of the white render, seconded by Councillor Peter Getkhan.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED the voting being 7 For, 4 Against and 0 Abstentions.

**RESOLVED:**

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendations and conditions as set out in the report with additional of a Condition regarding building maintenance. The wording of the Condition to be:

Condition:

Prior to the first occupation of the proposed development an external building management plan including a schedule of the maintenance of the external appearance of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The building management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

The Planning Officer reported that the suggested Informative at the end of the report stated "The applicant and/or their agent did not have formal pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority." To clarify, it was understood that the applicant sought informal advice from the Duty Officer but no formal pre-app was sought. This in no way impacts the material planning considerations of the case.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes was a little confused by the photograph circulated by the applicant as the application did not show a window in the extension.

Councillor Sara Bedford said part of the site was being used as a B&B and was the extension for the private dwelling house only or was it to enlarge the B&B although this was not clear in the report. The Planning Officer stated that this was the Officers understanding of the application. Although the site was used as a B&B the extension was for the private dwelling side of the building.

In accordance with Council procedure 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Debbie Morris said she was persuaded that the distance the applicant said the extension was from the front facade of the property would be 4 metres which was quite a distance. Looking at the front elevations it looked flush but knowing it would be 4 metres back she thought it definitely looked subordinate and did not share the Officer concerns that it would have a featureless and dominant presence and did not agree with the recommendation.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes was in agreement with Councillor Morris on that view and asked if the Committee wished to consider accepting the application with the Council's standard conditions relating to timeframe for implementation, in accordance with the approved plans and materials to match.

Councillor Peter Getkahn agreed he was going to suggest deferring the application for further consultation but if the Committee was minded to approve the application he was happy to move that the application be approved subject to the standard conditions, seconded by Councillor Debbie Morris.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chairman the voting being unaminious.

**RESOLVED:**

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the following Conditions and Informatives (agreed by the Committee after the meeting):

Conditions

C1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

C2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 181205, 181206/A

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policies CP1, CP9, CP10, CP11 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policies DM1, DM2, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C3 Unless specified on the approved plans, all new works or making good to the retained fabric shall be finished to match in size, colour, texture and profile those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory and to safeguard the character and appearance of the Rickmansworth Conservation Area in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013)

Informatives:

I1 With regard to implementing this permission, the applicant is advised as follows:

All relevant planning conditions must be discharged prior to the commencement of work. Requests to discharge conditions must be made by formal application. Fees are £116 per request (or £34 where the related permission is for extending or altering a dwellinghouse or other development in the curtilage of a dwellinghouse). Please note that requests made without the appropriate fee will be returned unanswered.

There may be a requirement for the approved development to comply with the Building Regulations. Please contact Hertfordshire Building Control (HBC) on 0208 207 7456 or at [buildingcontrol@hertfordshirebc.co.uk](mailto:buildingcontrol@hertfordshirebc.co.uk) who will be happy to advise you on building control matters and will protect your interests throughout your build project by leading the compliance process. Further information is available at [www.hertfordshirebc.co.uk](http://www.hertfordshirebc.co.uk).

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - Your development may be liable for CIL payments and you are advised to contact the CIL Officer for clarification with regard to this. It is a requirement under Regulation 67 (1), Regulation 42B(6) (in the case of residential annexes or extensions), and Regulation 54B(6) (for self-build housing) of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (As Amended) that a Commencement Notice (Form 6) is submitted to Three Rivers District Council as the Collecting Authority no later than the day before the day on which the chargeable development is to be commenced. DO NOT start your development until the Council has acknowledged receipt of the Commencement Notice. Failure to do so will mean you will lose the right to payment by instalments (where applicable), lose any exemptions already granted, and a surcharge will be imposed.

Care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to ensure no damage occurs to the verge or footpaths during construction. Vehicles delivering materials to this development shall not override or cause damage to the public footway. Any damage will require to be made good to the satisfaction of the Council and at the applicant's expense.

Where possible, energy saving and water harvesting measures should be incorporated. Any external changes to the building which may be subsequently required should be discussed with the Council's Development Management Section prior to the commencement of work.

I2 The applicant is reminded that the Control of Pollution Act 1974 allows local

authorities to restrict construction activity (where work is audible at the site boundary). In Three Rivers such work audible at the site boundary, including deliveries to the site and running of equipment such as generators, should be restricted to 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

**PC 38/19 19/1009/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling at No.30 and erection of a replacement two storey detached dwelling with accommodation in the roofspace. Alterations to the siting of boundary between No.28 and 30 and alterations to frontage. Demolition of existing single storey side extension and garage and construction of two storey side and rear extension with rooflights to side of No.28 at 28 – 30 BISHOPS AVENUE, NORTHWOOD HA6 3DG**

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates.

Councillor Debbie Morris referred to Paragraph 7.3.11 of the report which summarised that the proposed development would not comply with all aspects of the design guidelines although justification had been given before recommending approval. Could a summary be provided of all the ways this application did not comply with guidelines.

The Planning Officer advised that it would intrude a 45 degree splay line with the neighbour at No.32.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes reminded Members that these were guidelines. These dwellings were quite substantial with substantial gardens and were not as intrusive as terraced houses would be with extensions.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked about the separation distance between the new dwelling and the smaller dwelling as there was to be 1.6 metres maximum between No.30 and No.32 but 1.5 metres from No.28. It stated that it respects the spatial character of the streetscene. Could Officers identify the properties where the space was the same as this separation distance. She knew it was within guidelines but as it had been commented on these were genuinely large houses.

The Planning Officer said there were no specific figures but the aerial photopgraph showed the general spacing between properties. The Council's general guidance was 1.2 metres or 1 metre in more dense areas so a minium of 1.5 metres was exceeding our usual 1.2 metres. Officers felt there was appropriate spacing being maintained between the dwellings.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked if Officers had a block plan of the front drive of No.28 where it showed the parking configuration. This was shown to Members.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked if the application was approved could permitted development rights be removed on No.30 because it would be a very large house on the plot and she would be concerned about future extensions.

The Planning Officer said this could be included if there were particular aspects in terms of the types of works that Members were concerned about and particularly wanted removed from permitted development rights e.g. in relation to extensions or roof alterations.

Councillor Joanna Clemens had concerns about the demolition of the house also the taking of land from one plot to another plot which would impact on the streetscene.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes said the spacing was generous and it complied with our policies.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes moved that Planning Permission be Granted with an additional condition regarding permitted development, seconded Councillor Keith Martin.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chariman the voting being 8 For, 1 Against and 2 Abstentions

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendations and conditions as set out in the report with an additional Condition removing PD (Classes A and B) for No. 30.

The Condition to read:

Immediately following the implementation of this permission, notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any other revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) no development within the following Classes of Schedule 2 of the Order shall take place at No.30 Bishops Avenue.

Part 1

Class A - enlargement, improvement or other alteration to the dwelling

Class B - enlargement consisting of an addition to the roof

No development of any of the above classes shall be constructed or placed on any part of the land forming No.30 Bishops Avenue.

Reason: To ensure adequate planning control over further development having regard to the limitations of the site and neighbouring properties and in the interests of the visual amenities of the site and the area in general, in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

**PC 39/19 19/1179/FUL - Comprehensive redevelopment to provide 2 no. single storey warehouse Class B1c/B2/B8 units comprising a total of 16,590 sqm including 1,986 sqm ancillary B1a office space, access, landscaping and associated work at DEVELOPMENT SITE, MAPLE LODGE, MAPLE LODGE CLOSE, MAPLE CROSS**

Councillor Sarah Nelmes wished to advise Members of the Committee to remember that they cannot comment on whether they approve or disapprove of granting the application because if they do they would not be able to be a Member at the Committee which actually approved or refused the application. The Committee tonight are asking questions, advising of any issues they have about the application and giving any comments.

The Planning Officer reported that the report before Members was a Preliminary Report. Members would be familiar with these reports on other major applications. The intention of the report was to set out where we were with the application to date, in terms of consultee and neighbour comments received. It also set out an overview of the material considerations and planning policies against which the application would ultimately be determined. It provided Members with an opportunity to raise any questions or points or clarification that they would wish Officers to consider and provide in a detailed response to be provided in a full report in due course. The application was not being determined today. An updated report with recommendation would be returned to

Committee in due course for determination.

There had been some updates since the preliminary report was published:

The applicant had submitted visualisations, the vision document can be viewed online and the images are also shown on the screens this evening.

3 additional objections had been received, these reiterate objections summarised in the Committee report at Paragraph 4.2.4.

The Environment Agency had submitted comments this week (13 August). The full comments can be viewed online and will be provided in an updated report in due course. Their comments are detailed and need to be reviewed by officers, however, at this stage the EA have advised that “the proposal will only be acceptable subject to a number of planning conditions”.

Councillor David Raw was concerned it mentioned in the report asbestos on the site. This was a very dangerous material to deal with and it did not state which governing bodies should be involved in checking this out and looking at it before any work was done on the site. Councillor Sarah Nelmes queried whether this was a planning matter.

Councillor Raj Khuroya sought clarification with regard to the TRDC Traffic Engineer report as there did not seem to be one. The Planning Officer said the TRDC Traffic Engineer had not commented on the application to date. Highways at the County Council had provided comments which were included in the report. At this stage they had requested additional information before they submit their comments.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes wondered if a suntrack had been done on the site which might help Members to understand what potential issues there were with shading. The Planning Officer said there hadn't been to date but she noted the comment.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes said on the number of movements there had been some spectacular comments and she could not find where the responses were on the proposed movements. The Planning Officer said in relation to the highways trips that was something that Officers needed to clarify with the applicant. The Highways comments referred to figures in the transport statement which talked about peak AM and peak PM. There was also a noise report which had some other figures in which may show why there was some confusion with the figures. Officers needed to clarify the figures before the report came back and also receive the comments from the County Council Highways Officers.

Councillor Debbie Morris said on the asbestos the report it said at Paragraph 7.11.21 the Environmental Health Officer had commented that whilst some outline remedial measures had been discussed a formal remediation strategy would be required although guidance had been provided. It was not just the strategy that was required we must ensure that if there was any risk to human health from the presence of asbestos that the strategy had to be implemented and signed off not just drawn up. Secondly there was a reference to the distance from unit 1 (approximately 25 metres) to 19 Longmore Close the closest residential property. When a report comes back to the Committee she would like to know the distance and the proximity of these huge buildings on all the neighbours and the impact on local residents not just the one that was most immediately closest but all the neighbours who would potentially be impacted.

Councillor Matthew Bedford said on the vehicle movements because of all the comments that had been made he had looked at the noise assessment and if he understood it right the figures were much lower than the figures that were circulating on social media. The noise report was talking about 70 HGVs a day not 900 clearly this needed to be clarified because the figures were so different. It would also be helpful to

have clarified the question about flooding because again some comments suggested that development of the site was likely to increase flooding in neighbouring areas and other comments suggested the development of the site was likely to reduce the water flow into neighbouring areas particularly the neighbouring nature reserve. Again the Committee needed to have some clarity on what the actual situation was.

Councillor Chris Lloyd's first comment related to Paragraph 4.1.5 in the report regarding Affinity Water. His assumption was that this would be explored and the Committee would be given more detail in the next report and asked if this was correct? The Planning Officer advised that was correct. At the moment there was an objection by Affinity Water which the applicant was aware of and it was up to the applicant to try and resolve this but it was one of the areas which would be expanded on in the full report

Councillor Chris Lloyd's second comment related to the water going off the site into Springwell Lake. He had a number of questions and would like to see some details and understand and make sure that these were addressed because there could be potential contamination of water.

Councillor David Raw said at the Full Council Members they had discussed vehicle pollution and here we were talking about 40 lorries and 150 vehicles so how much pollution were we talking about. This would be significant and was against what we all spoke about at the Full Council meeting. He felt it may be a good idea to have a site visit. Councillor Sarah Nelmes said possibly but this was not the moment to consider whether or not to make a site visit.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked about the noise comments as it had been said that the measuring was not done from the closest property. Could Officers make sure that when noise levels were done they were from those who would be most directly affected. There was also some speculation that this would be a 24/7 operation. Could this be clarified.

Councillor Raj Khuroya had noticed that some of the reports were outdated with some being 2013/2014. Was the Officer aware of these outdated reports. Councillor Sarah Nelmes asked if the Member could point out which reports were outdated.

Councillor Raj Khuroya said in particular the water report but there were a number of them. Could Officers give any update on the site contamination and the extent of contamination. The Planning Officer was making a note of all the comments raised and these were things that would be updated for the next report. She noted what Members were saying about the outdated reports and the contamination and these were things which would be addressed moving forward.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes also asked about access and restrictions to Maple Lodge Close. She was very concerned to see that although Members were told the applicant would be using the other access she would want some sort of methodology to be provided.

Councillor Peter Getkahn said it was a residential area but it was also recognised as a transport route to a local school and with the amount of HGVs that would be going to the site there had to be a robust plan to ensure that children were not put in danger. He referred to Paragraph 4.1.9 of the report with his concern being that in no way does it mention the school and the increase in traffic and especially as the school was already close to one of the busiest motorways in the country and one of the busiest junctions. This needed to be addressed along with the fact that children were walking to the school and would be surrounded by a significant increase in traffic from largely diesel vehicles which had proved to be dangerous.

Councillor Debbie Morris said the Landscape Officer had said the existing trees had not been given sufficient consideration within the design process, that this would lead to unnecessary tree loss and damage to higher quality trees and impact on a visually important landscape feature on the site. Could Officers discuss this further with the applicant and secondly no one had commented on the size of the warehouses. You can see that they would be massive and she would like some consideration given to reducing their size, not having both of them and their positioning on the site. The speaker had asked for air quality assessments and a comprehensive environmental impact assessment to be made were these things we can ask for. The Planning Officer said they had noted all the comments but could not say at this stage whether it would be reasonable or not to request them but certainly they would look at all the comments and work out what was needed to bring back to Members.

Councillor Raj Khuroya said he could see that there were at least 7 bodies which had not responded and he would like to see comments from all those bodies as this was an important report.

In accordance with Council procedure 35(b) a member of the public spoke against the application.

Councillor Sara Bedford said the reason why Members were having this meeting was to ensure that they asked all the questions they needed to and had all the information in front of them to make a decision hopefully in October. It was not some form of holding up the application or pushing it through the back door. This Council took its responsibilities very seriously and had a duty to the people it represents and also had a duty to ensure that planning decisions were made on the correct information and did not make decisions based on half the information. Tonight Members would not be either for or against the application but were gathering information. It was really important that they did that. She had seen the conditions suggested by the Commercial Environmental Health Manager regarding the possible contamination of the land but could not see anything about having some sort of maintenance plan going forward and asked should that happen? Obviously if there was that level of contamination and planning permission was to be granted then we would want to ensure that there was a plan going forward to monitor the land.

Councillor Phil Williams said Maple Cross had, had enough. They had HS2 thrown at them with no consultation, they got the water extraction at West Hyde with tens of thousands of litres going out by Eden water to whichever shop you buy your water in. At Pylesfield tonnes of rock was being extracted everyday onto the roads of Maple Cross and everyday with the debris was not being cleared up. We cannot take any more. Lets start building a chemist or a doctors and not things they don't want. As the Lead Member for Sustainability we have got to be seen to be taking action. This does not fit in with any of these strategies. Where was the air quality pollution readout. There was one in Mill End but why was there not one in Maple Cross. This development would be bigger than two football pitches and would be as high as three London buses in a residents back garden next to a wildlife reserve and water meadow. Had Members seen the biodiversity study done by the applicant it showed a picture of tower blocks in London with one tree outside how was that creating biodiversity. Lets get the Maple Lodge to do a biodiversity study then we can see what was really going on.

Councillor Debbie Morris said on parking she had found the officer comments a bit confusing and would like clarification on the figures.

Councillor Peter Getkahn said it was a very comprehensive report but he felt that he had not received enough detail on the adjacent residential properties. He noted that this was land had been allocated for employment but it was really a mixed area. He found it concerning when you look at the bulk, massing and design of the development

it was not really in keeping with the area and would like more detail. Also we must consider the mental health and physical health impact the development would have.

Councillor Raj Khuroya asked what the impact would be on the adjacent residential properties regarding pricing.

Councillor Sara Bedford thanked the Planning Officer on the preparation of the report but said if the Committee have any questions they did not save them until just before the October meeting and put any points forward as soon as possible.

Councillor Raj Khuroya noticed that there was no response from the Police. The Planning Officer advised that she had been chasing all the consultees throughout the application process and where they had replied the comments had been included in the report. Additional comments had been received post the report from the Environmental Agency. She would continue to chase them all because she appreciated that Members wanted to have their comments and noted the importance of the responses.

Councillor Matthew Bedford appreciated that Officers were doing their best to get the consultees to respond but advised that they were not actually obliged to respond but if Ward Members can put pressure on them to respond that would be helpful.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked about the external lighting.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes assured the residents at the meeting and all the other residents in Maple Cross that they would get plenty of notice of the date for when the report would come back to the Committee. Provisionally at the moment it was looking like being 17 October 2019 but if it was not that date residents would be advised but it would definitely not be September.

#### RESOLVED:

Members noted there was no recommendation for approval or refusal at this stage in the consideration of the application.

Noted the report, and Members made general comments with regards to the material planning issues raised by the application as detailed above.

**PC 40/19 19/1180/FUL - Demolition of detached bungalow and garage and erection of a terrace of 4 x 4 bed two storey dwellings with accommodation in the roof space, modified vehicular access, forecourt parking, refuse and cycle storage and amenity space at AVIEMORE, 65 LOWER ROAD, CHORLEYWOOD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 5LA**

The Planning Officer reported that since the agenda was published, a further six objection letters and a petition containing 64 signatures objecting to the proposal have been received. There are no additional material planning considerations contained within the objections which have not already been listed and addressed within the report.

The first line of paragraph 7.4.9 should be amended to read; "In conclusion, it is not considered that the proposed development would be out of character with the built form within the vicinity of the application site".

In relation to parking, the application proposes policy compliant parking provision however in view of the parking pressures within the immediate area Officers consider it appropriate to prevent future occupiers from obtaining parking permits which would be secured by a Section 106 legal agreement. This is currently progressing and as such the recommendation should be amended to read that the decision be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services to grant planning permission

subject to the completion of that Section 106 agreement. In relation to viability officers had now had the review back in relation to the appraisal it shows a deficit of over £224,00 and concludes the scheme would not be able to support an affordable housing payment as it would not be viable. With regards to ecology Hertfordshire Ecology required further surveys to be undertaken the applicant provided a final emergence survey and Herts Ecology have reviewed this and are satisfied that no Bats were observed emerging from the building so it is considered that no roost is present within the building and as such Condition C3 of the report relating to bat surveys is not required and should be removed. They have advised that the apple tree which has moderate potential and was not surveyed and therefore condition C11 of the report which relates to a tree survey remains applicable.

Councillor Raj Khuroya pointed out that this is the third time this application has been presented at Committee. He had concerns regarding the height of the extension and moved that the Committee make a site visit, seconded by Councillor Sara Bedford.

Chorleywood Parish Council had requested that this application be called to the Committee. The application had not addressed the fundamental concerns that had been previously raised. The flats would result in overdevelopment of the site with the height alone dominating the neighbouring properties and particularly its proximity to its southern neighbour at Wroxham which would certainly be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers and would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development did not provide the desired amount of amenity space to each of the dwellings and the report acknowledged that the smallest amenity space would be below the provisions of the core strategy. They also had concern on the parking provision for 12 vehicles and the increased traffic flow in this narrow part of the road and the restricted viewing due the parking of the cars. It was often not possible for two cars to pass each other and the visibility entering and exiting the site would impact on highway and pedestrian safety. In the absence of a parking management plan it was difficult to see how the site could cope with the pressures from the additional vehicles.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chairman the voting being unaminious.

RESOLVED:

That the application BE DEFERRED for a site visit.

**PC 41/19 19/1183/FUL - Loft conversion including front dormer window and rear rooflights, alterations to roof form of the existing two storey rear projection, single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration detail at 17 ADRIAN ROAD, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WD5 0AG**

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chairman the voting being unaminious.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendations and conditions as set out in the report.

**CHAIRMAN**