
PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Of a virtual/remote meeting held on Thursday 25 June 2020 at 7.30pm to 9.00pm

Councillors present:

Sarah Nelmes (Chair)
Sara Bedford
Raj Khiroya
Marilyn Butler
Steve Drury
Peter Getkahn

Alison Scarth
Chris Lloyd
Debbie Morris
Stephen King
David Raw

Officers: Claire Westwood, Adam Ralton, Claire Wilson, Kimberley Rowley, Sarah Haythorpe, Sherrie Ralton

PC 01/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Keith Martin with the named substitute member being Councillor Alison Scarth

PC 02/20 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 21 and the reconvened meeting held on 28 May 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair.

PC 03/20 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

None received.

PC 04/20 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 Councillor's. 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 any view.”

Councillor Debbie Morris declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 as she

lived within the neighbour consultation area (20/0889/FUL – Erection of front gates and alterations to existing driveway at MAPESBURY, SANDY LANE, NORTHWOOD, HA6 3HA) and left the meeting during the consideration of this application.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 20/0589/FUL - Part single, part first floor, part two storey side and rear extensions, connection of outbuilding to main dwelling, loft conversion include extension to roof, increase in ridge height and installation of front and rear dormers and construction of raised terraces at PIMLICO HOUSE, HYDE LANE, NASH MILLS, HP3 8SA as a fellow Councillor was the Agent or had been involved in the plans for this application.

PC 05/20 20/0467/FUL - Demolition of Grove Court and the construction of 42 apartments, 19 x 1-bedroom and 23 x 2-bedroom units, associated parking and landscaping, cycle and refuse/recycling stores and shared access at 40-92 GROVE COURT, GROVE CRESCENT, CROXLEY GREEN, WD3 3JU

The Planning Officer reported that there were two updates Condition C2 on the Plans be updated as Plan 012 should be P6 not P5. Comments had now been received from Herts Fire and Rescue Service who raised no objections, noting that the swept path drawings show compliance for vehicle access and that more specific details such as provision of the fire hydrant, would be picked up in the Building Regulations.

Photos had been provided by the objectors to the application which would be displayed for Members to see after running through the plans and Officers photos.

Councillor Chris Lloyd asked if it could be confirmed that the four storey part of the development was now further away from Manor Way, what the total number of bedrooms would be and whether it was the same as the previous application on the total number of parking spaces verses the total number of flats. There was concern the parking would overspill into Grove Crescent.

Councillor Steve Drury also had concerns regarding parking. He also referred to Paragraph 7.6.2 (amenity) where it stated there would be demonstrable harm to the neighbours in Grove Crescent opposite because the building was on the corner and because of the relative orientations. This was not the same to the rear i.e. Manor Way, where properties backed onto the development.

Councillor Sara Bedford asked for clarification on the distance between the rear fence of the houses in Manor Way, the current elevation and the proposed elevation.

The Planning Officer responded that with regard to the parking there were 47 parking spaces proposed and there were 42 flats therefore one space per unit and 5 visitor spaces. The report set out in the Parking section Paragraph 7.11 that there would be a short fall of 32 spaces however Officers had taken into consideration existing site circumstances. Only 6 parking spaces served the existing development. On the accessibility of the site and other considerations, Officers consider that the level of parking proposed would be acceptable. The Planning Officer showed a block plan to the Committee with regards to the distances. There was an orange dotted line showing the siting of the existing building and showed the siting of Block A and Block B as proposed. Block B would be two stories to the south increasing to three stories in the middle and four stories to the North so the four story element would be further away from the boundary than the existing building. A Member had queried the number of units which referred to a previous scheme which had been withdrawn so was not determined and did not form a

material consideration for which Officers can access this application. The point was correct that the number of bedrooms was the same all be it one less flat from the withdrawn application which was for 43 units and this application for 42. The comment about the impact on the neighbours, it would impact on the neighbours at the rear which had been assessed in detail in Paragraph 7.6 of the report. On the comparisons of the distances the officer showed a plan highlighting the existing distances. With regard to Block B and the two storey element at the south this would be sited 9.7 metres from the eastern boundary which was comparable with the existing building whereas the four storey element to the north would be sited approximately 22 metres from the boundary whereas the existing building is 11 metres.

Councillor Peter Getkahn had concern about the amount of allocated parking spaces for the previous development which was built a long time ago. It felt wrong using that as evidence on how it should be built currently. We don't have any precedent in planning and using this seemed odd.

Councillor Debbie Morris said the Officer had made a point about Block A and the four storey element of it being further back than the existing but the existing block is only two storeys and as per Paragraph 7.6.13 of the report the four storey element is 34 metres away which does not provide the distance that is required or expected for developments of this height. Similarly this was relevant for the three storey element.

The Planning Officer noted Councillor Getkahn's comment but essentially existing site circumstances are a material consideration so it was a valid point to consider however it was not as set out in the report the sole reason for finding the parking provision as proposed to be acceptable. With regards to the back to back distances Paragraph 7.6.13 also sets out that our Appendix 2 states that mitigating circumstances such as careful layout, orientation, screening, window position may allow a reduction in those distances between elevations. The scheme to those elevations which back onto Manor Way includes screening, obscure glazing, oriole windows and other design features which Officers consider would prevent overlooking and was addressed in the report.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Committee virtual meeting protocol which sits alongside the Council Procedure Rules a member of the public spoke against the application and a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

Councillor David Raw said the design was out of character with the surrounding area and asked if other Councillor felt this development would not fit in. The Chair said the design and look was not a planning consideration. The other properties in the area were built in the 1950s/60s.

Croxley Green Parish Council said they had objected to the application with regards to policy CA1 of the neighbourhood plan which had not been met for that part of the streetscene. There would be a four storey block in this particular area but it was not part of the streetscene where three was the maximum. They considered Condition C10 to be very important with regard to the materials chosen if the application was approved. The Parish Council believed this was overdevelopment of the site. They had privacy concerns which would impact on residents in Manor Way with the building going from two storeys to four storeys and there being insufficient distance due to the height of the proposed development. The Planning Officer had gone into detail about this not being a problem but the Parish Council were not convinced. They would encourage a site visit from Manor Way to fully understand the site circumstances. The Chair advised that site visits were not possible at this time.

Councillor Steve Drury asked about the removal of the screening trees. He had looked through the landscaping statement within the plans but could not see anything about screening trees being removed.

Councillor Debbie Morris heard what the Planning Officer had said about separation distances and mitigation matters with regard to privacy but her concerns remain that the amenity space of the residents in Manor Way would be adversely affected by the development. She was also concerned with regard to the amenity space proposed for the development. Having heard the objector speak about the extent of parking, to be situated by the rear gardens in Manor Way, she believed there was over 20 parking spaces proposed there. Whilst she appreciated the need to provide parking having that number of spaces so close to people's homes and rear gardens inevitably would cause noise, pollution and disturbance. Compared to what was there now, 6 parking spaces, this would really impact negatively on the enjoyment of their gardens and homes. She felt that the reason why the parking had not been placed at the front was because it would then mean that the buildings would have to be closer to Manor Way therefore causing more overlooking visually or the perception of overlooking. On amenity space she understood that the vast majority of these properties would have their own private amenity space which was good but wished to confirm the extent of communal amenity space that had been calculated in coming to the aggregate quoted. She understood that the Planning Officer had included the area shaded green to the rear of the parking spaces to the north of the site and she honestly could not imagine anyone using that area as amenity space. She could not see children playing by the car park, people sitting in deck chairs or sunbeds with cars coming in and out. She felt this was more of a soft landscaping arrangement rather than usable amenity space and felt this was not acceptable.

Councillor Raj Khiroya said in normal circumstances he would have requested a site visit but it was not possible in the current climate. His concern related to overlooking especially from Manor Way, parking and overdevelopment of the site from two to four storey. He could see the concerns of the neighbours and why they felt this development was something which would affect their day to day life.

The Planning Officer responded to Members comments. With regard to the design and whether it was in keeping with the character of the area that was a subjective matter. Grove Crescent is characterised by a mixture of two and three storey buildings and there are a lot of three storey flats. There was one four storey flat block. Officers were not suggesting that this was a predominant character but there's an example albeit on the other side of the road. The buildings are stepped and would not be a single mass. Officers felt the design and the breaking up of the two, three and four storey elements would be in keeping and materials would be required to be submitted for agreement via the discharge of the condition so there would be control to ensure the materials were appropriate. With regards to privacy screens the height proposed was a standard size and that was recognised by the Planning Inspectorate when imposing conditions. With regards to concerns over time with regard to maintenance the condition included that they would have to be maintained. Someone could not buy a flat and remove the screening as that would be in breach of the condition. With regard to Councillor Drury's comments Officers did not believe there were any trees proposed to be removed and additional landscaping proposed was part of the scheme all be it indicative at this stage. A detailed landscaping scheme would be required by condition. In terms of overlooking of the neighbours in Manor Way this had been covered previously and was set out in the Officers report on why the scheme was considered acceptable. With regard to amenity space the Officer shared a drawing of the development which showed 42 flats of which 36 had a private balcony or private terrace which was 86% of the flats. The red areas on the plan showed the

communal amenity space areas. Officers had noted Councillor Morris's concerns on this and the area to the north which was over 307 square metres and was 50 metres x 60 metres. Officers considered this can be taken into consideration as part of the overall quantum of amenity space. Ultimately Members may consider this differently but if Members do consider that there is a shortfall of amenity space they should consider whether that shortfall was harmful. Members should also consider that the majority of the units have private amenity space and that the site is well connected to Baldwins Lane in terms of short distance and also connectivity. In terms of the parking there is parking at the rear but also proposals to introduce more landscaping including a landscape buffer to the rear of the site. Officers had set out in the report that they consider the development complies with Paragraph 11 of the NPPF. Just to ensure Members were aware if a different recommendation was to be reached by the Committee they would need to give consideration to whether identified adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development.

The Chair reminded Members that should a site visit be required it would be very difficult to arrange in terms of the PPE required.

Councillor David Raw said the speaker in support said none of the previous residents had decided to live in the new development so that was something that Members should consider. He referred to Policy CP12 which stated regard should be had to the local context and the need to conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area. He was not sure this development would do that and why there had been so many concerns from residents.

The Chair commented that she had helped some people to move out of the flats. Thrive had been proactive in moving people and providing compensation and they had been moved into newly decorated flats. She was not aware of anyone being unhappy with their new homes.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said looking at the application there was a shortage of parking spaces. On the amenity space he would not wish any children to play there although it was important to have these spaces. He felt it was overdevelopment. There was no possibility of additional trees between the development and the residents in Manor Way on the boundary. He would not want to have that number of cars there as this was currently green space. On the plan shown to Members he could see where the current building was sited. The car parking spaces currently were sited away from the residents therefore did not impact on residents as there were only six movements from the parking spaces. There had been fewer vehicles moments as older people had lived in the flats but his assumption was that the accommodation would be available for all people of all ages. He welcomed the type of accommodation but looking at the plans it was gross overdevelopment. The parking was inadequate, the amenity space was not good, would mean additional parked cars in Grove Crescent, the site is on a bend and he felt that the applicant needed to think again and come back with less houses. He appreciated the changes which had been made to move the four storey element further away from the neighbours but would like to see a smaller scheme and this scheme withdrawn.

The Chair had a contrary view to that and welcomed a development which provided this amount of affordable housing and would make homes for families. The size of the scheme made it affordable and viable to be able to provide that level of social and affordable housing.

Councillor Debbie Morris agreed with Councillor Lloyd's comments. She did share the view it was important to provide affordable housing but not at the detriment of existing residents. She moved refusal of planning permission, seconded by

Councillor Stephen King, on the grounds of overdevelopment, adverse impact on neighbours by reason of site, siting, height, bulk, loss of privacy and perceived overlooking. She did not believe that the insufficient amenity space was so great that it constituted a reason for refusal although she did not like it.

Councillor Peter Getkahn agreed with the comments. If application was to be refused could the parking concerns be added and he would be interested to hear if the amenity space concerns could be added. The design required a lot more work and whilst he had sympathy with what was proposed the design could be done better and smaller.

The Planning Officer clarified a couple of points if the Committee were minded to refuse the application. Councillor Morris had moved the motion for refusal on the grounds of overdevelopment and therefore the impact that would have on neighbours due to the height, siting, the bulk of the development and the perceived overlooking. There had been separate discussions by Members on parking and that could potentially be tied into that reason on the grounds of the overdevelopment. Members may view that as part of the reason why there was a shortfall of parking. The Planning Officer wished to establish if Members were combining that or establishing a separate reason for refusal relating to parking.

Councillor Debbie Morris said she should have added the disturbance caused by the increased activity from the larger provision of parking than currently existing which also negatively impacts on the neighbouring amenity. She had no problem with accepting other Members additions to the reasons for refusal but left it for Officers to comment if these could be included.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said Members had commented on parking and the impact this would have but also the fact there would be a 32 space shortfall and whether that could be a reason for refusal to add or would it weaken the case. Listening to the arguments he would be minded to support this but wanted to ensure Members had the strongest possible case to defend.

The Planning Officer said it was a difficult question to respond to given the Officer recommendation to approve. Given the concerns raised by Members which seem to be in part centred around it being an overdevelopment of the site, it would be appropriate that the parking could be included in that as a single reason both in terms of addressing Councillor Morris's point in terms of impact on neighbours due to its siting on the rear boundary but also in terms of the shortfall against standards. If Members were minded to refuse the application the exact wording could be circulated to the Committee after the meeting.

Councillor Steve Drury had been looking at the plans and asked if it was possible go back for the planners to have another look at this. Would it be possible to situate the parking on the eastern side at the back end of the Manor Way gardens, to have two lots of parking on the north side where there is amenity space. Therefore there would be two lots of parking there. The whole of the green area where the parking is proposed at the back of Manor Way now could be amenity space and we could then have some trees and a bigger buffer zone to help the residents of Manor Way. The Chair said it was for the developer to decide how to change the plans not Officers.

The Planning Officer clarified that the application before the Committee was for determination and depending on what happens tonight there may be further applications or further discussions but ultimately it was this application which needed to be determined. Officers were not able to advise what might happen but noted Councillor Drury's comments.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 7 For, 2 Against and 1 Abstention.

One Member was not able to vote as they had not been in the virtual meeting room for the entire debate as required under Point 27 of the virtual meeting protocol.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON

On grounds that the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and would result in harm to neighbouring amenity due to its height, siting, bulk, perceived overlooking and disturbance due to siting of car parking spaces to the rear boundary and would fail to provide sufficient car parking spaces.

The exact wording to be circulated to Members for agreement.

- R1 The proposed development by reason of its siting, height, bulk and layout would result in a perception of overlooking to neighbouring occupiers and unacceptable noise and disturbance from use of the car parking spaces directly adjacent to the rear gardens of neighbours, and would therefore cause demonstrable harm to the amenities of the occupants of adjacent properties in Manor Way to the east. In addition, insufficient car parking spaces would be provided to serve the development, resulting in increased pressure for parking on Grove Crescent. The proposal would result in an unneighbourly overdevelopment of the site and would be contrary to Policies CP1, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policies DM1, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and Policy CA2 and Appendix B of the Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan Referendum Version (December 2018).

PC 06/20 20/0589/FUL – Part single, part two storey side extensions, single storey rear extension and connection of outbuilding to main dwelling, loft conversion including extension to roof, increase in ridge height and installation of front and rear dormers and construction of raised terraces at PIMLICO HOUSE, HYDE LANE, NASH MILLS, HP3 8SA.

The Planning Officer reported that following the publication of the Committee report which recommended refusal Officers had received additional information and further clarification from the applicant and the applicant's agent regarding the matter surrounding the existing cottage to the rear of the property. They had provided an addendum which explained and confirmed to Officers beyond reasonable doubt that the existing cottage was part of the original dwelling in terms of pre 1948. On that basis and having looked at the impact on the Green Belt again in terms of a numerical/disproportionate above the original building officers considered that the development would be acceptable in Green Belt terms for the reasons explained in the addendum. For that reason the recommendation is now for approval subject to the conditions set out in the addendum.

The Chair was of the view that changes made had made it acceptable in the Green Belt.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Committee virtual meeting protocol which sits alongside the Council Procedure Rules a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Raj Khiroya said he had read the addendum and it showed beyond reasonable doubt it is part of the original cottage and moved approval of the application. Councillor Debbie Morris was also happy with the revisions and the

Officers opinion and was pleased that the applicant had been able to satisfy the Officers that the cottage was original and seconded the motion that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

Condition 1 – Standard Time Limit

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.

Condition 2 – In Accordance with Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TRDC 001 (Location Plan), 1222 SK100A, 1222 SK101A, 1222 SK102, 1222 SK103E, 1222 SK104G and 1222 SK105G.

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

Condition 3 - Materials to Match Existing Building

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 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 07/20 20/0748/FUL – Retention of existing parking area and creation of additional parking area for company vehicles including alterations to land levels and associated hard and soft landscaping and loft conversion of existing bungalow for office use including dormers at THE Paddock, LITTLE OXHEY LANE, CARPENDERS PARK, WATFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD19 5BA

The Planning Officer reported that there was no update.

The Chair reported concerns about the landscaping issues as it was not attractive and asked if there was not more conditions on landscaping. The Planning Officer said the most recent application for the extension was refused so there were no conditions attached on that application last year. Officers were recommending refusal of this application and therefore there were no conditions. There was clearly a lot of landscaping and planting proposed and the report explained that Officers do consider that the scheme with the landscaping that had been put forward would enhance the landscaping at the visual part of the site. The landscaping itself would add a biodiversity value to the site. The planning balance

explains that Officers judge the harm to the Green Belt to not be outweighed by that and the other positive elements that are explained in the report.

Councillor Debbie Morris said it was her understanding from Paragraph 7.2.2 that under one of the previous planning permissions in 2013 there was a requirement for soft landscaping but that was not implemented.

Councillor Alison Scarth said Lockett's are a very important provider of transport in the area particularly for school children and special needs children and it would be very sad if this was lost as they could not increase the number of vehicles they have there. Landscaping had been mentioned and she felt very strongly that Members should press for all the landscaping that had been promised and was put in place and even increased. Although they are lowering the level of where some of the larger vehicles are going to be parked she would like to think that screening was put up in terms of the landscaping.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Committee virtual meeting protocol which sits alongside the Council Procedure Rules a member of the public and Watford Rural Parish Councillor spoke against the application and a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Debbie Morris picked up on a comment made by the speaker in support of the application. From the letter which had been circulated to Members there was less hard standing so what are the vehicles going to be parked on. She wished to draw Members attention to Paragraph 7.13.10 and 7.13.11 on the absence of evidence and that the existing fleet numbers cannot be accommodated on site.

The Planning Officer confirmed the car parking areas on the plans would be concrete parking areas.

Councillor Raj Khiroya said he had read the report and looked at the application and personally felt this was a very special case. The service provided to the community outweighed the harm to the Green Belt and felt they should be supported. He moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen King, that planning permission be granted.

The Chair had a lot of sympathy with that view and the undoubted need for the service. If the Council do actually get the landscaping that is promised then it might improve the site rather than to its detriment.

Councillor Stephen King said he knew the feelings of the Parish Council but he was also in support of Councillor Khiroya's comments and would be willing to accept approval and overturn the Officers recommendation to refuse.

The Chair said if Members were minded to overturn the recommendation it had to be made clear the reasons for this and why Members are giving more weight to special circumstances than the officers had and less to the visual harm to the Green Belt and its openness. Some thought was needed on this if Members were minded to overturn the decision and if the weighted balance was the other way on the value of the service provided on the site. Members could potentially improve the look of the site, the biodiversity of it and the greenery of the site.

Councillor Sara Bedford was inclined in the same way as the Chair. There had been discussion for similar type of use at Mullanys in Garston who had been looking to enlarge the site on Green Belt land. That had been a similar situation and she felt there could be very special circumstances here for the use of the land. If it was not to be there where would it be. Members had heard the applicant's agent offer to look at other forms of landscaping etc. and we could look at what we

would want. She would want a landscaping plan put forward as part of any condition. It would take a while to put together all the conditions for this because of the Officers recommendation for refusal but she would like to see if Officers could put together something around a landscape plan and other usage because it would be shame if we lost this use.

It was advised that Councillor David Raw had left the meeting as he had lost connection to the meeting. He did not return to the meeting.

The Planning Officer said if the application was overturned by Members and as Councillor Bedford had mentioned Members resolved to grant planning permission it would need to be subject to a number of conditions as the Officers recommendation was to refuse. Officers did not have a detailed list of conditions. There was a number of things that could be brought out of the report which would be relevant conditions and it was worth Members thinking at this stage if there were any particular additional aspects that they might want to secure to be submitted to Officers at a later date or to guide the applicant down a particular path using informative notes to encourage a particular approach. If Members were minded to approve subject to conditions Officers would always include a time limit condition, pre commencement condition as Officers would have to get the applicants approval before putting on any conditions that restrict their ability to start the works before submitting information. Bearing in mind the characteristics of this site before any works start it was likely Officers would want details of how the existing trees would be protected, landscaping scheme giving detailed specifications of exactly what would be planted and where and the timescales for the implementation of that. Officers would not be prescriptive in that but if Members wanted to give particular direction that was something which could be mentioned and could be put in the informative. Other pre commencement matters on drainage had been mentioned and Officers would want a pre commencement condition to understand how the drainage would work on the site, how the construction activities would be managed and any details of external lighting. Officers would also want conditions that require the car parking area to be laid out in full in accordance with the submitted plans before it was used. They would also want plans to require that the new garden area for the bungalow was laid out and permanently maintained as amenity space. The application also included amenity space to the bungalow so they would want the materials for the dormer windows to match the materials of the bungalow. We would probably want to restrict the hours of use of the car parking area and would want the Oxhey Lane vehicular access to only be used for emergency purposes and restrict the use of that car parking area to only be used in connection with this business and not become a general purpose car parking area. Those were the sort of conditions Officers would probably look at and were highlighted from the consultee responses. The Officer asked if there were any other points Member might think should be included and any informatives. Bearing in mind if they would stop the developer from being able to commence anything until they submitted these details to us we have to get the developers agreement to them.

Councillor Sara Bedford thanked the Planning Officer for reminding Members of the necessity now under the new system to get the acceptance of the applicant to have pre commencement conditions but she felt in this case that it was absolutely vital if Members were going to look at the very special circumstances in the Green Belt. The applicant agents had told the Committee that they were genuinely wanting to bring these things forward so she assumed that they would be very genuine in wanting to agree to the pre commencement conditions and to the fulfilment of them. Without those this was not an acceptable development in the Green Belt and she would not be supporting it.

Councillor Steve Drury totally agreed with Councillor Bedford's comments and felt the Planning Officer had made some very good points. He recalled reading through the report where it stated there was 200 metres of garden space which should be looked after and maintained but also noted there was already some sort of Tree Preservation Order (TPO) already on the site. A tree had been taken down which they did ask permission for but he hoped they would replace this at some point. Does the present TPO cover any other trees on the site? If not and there were any other trees could the Landscape team have a look to see if they could have a TPO on the trees.

The Planning Officer advised that they would take the matter of the TPO away separately to ask the Tree and Landscape Officers to review the trees on the site and ensure that they were satisfied that any tree which is considered to be of a high amenity value and worthy of a TPO was protected.

The Chair asked the Planning Officer if they now had sufficient information as to why the Committee were wishing to grant permission as a special circumstance and therefore going against the Officer recommendation of refusal. The Planning Officer advised that he understood from Members comments the value of the service that was being provided, the location of the business and where else could it be located. The Officer had an explanation from Members. It was in the Members gift to decide what their reasoning was.

The Chair said there was also the reason for the potential improvement in the green environment by these changes.

Councillor Raj Khiroya was happy with the comments the Officer had made and the points made with regard to the conditions if planning permission was granted and they sounded fair and reasonable. He asked if the conditions could be circulated to Members to agree the final wording.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED the voting being 9 For, 1 Against and no abstentions.

The Planning Officer confirmed that officers would circulate the conditions to Members for agreement before seeking the applicant's approval.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions and informatives (the wording having been agreed with Members after the meeting):

Overturn of the officer recommendation subject to conditions/informatives, details of which were circulated to Members for agreement and are provided below:

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: Drawing Nos. 201304/LP/01B, 201304/PL/302 Rev B, 201304/PL/503 Rev E, 201304/PL/504 Rev E, 201304/PL/505 Rev G and 19514.004 Rev B.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, in the proper interests of planning and to ensure the development maintains the character of the area and the visual amenities of the Green Belt in accordance with Policies CP1, CP6, CP9, CP10, CP11 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM2, DM4, DM6, DM7, DM9, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C3 - The development hereby permitted shall be implemented only in accordance with the submitted Phase II Arboricultural Impact Assessment updated 6 April 2020 (Ref 101478).

The tree protection measures, including fencing, shall be undertaken in full accordance with the submitted Tree Protection Plan dated 4/7/2020 appended to the abovementioned Arboricultural Impact Assessment before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed within any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made. No fires shall be lit or liquids disposed of within 10.0m of an area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the approved scheme.

Reason: This condition is a pre commencement condition to ensure that no development takes place until appropriate measures are taken to prevent damage being caused to trees during construction, to protect the visual amenities of the trees, area and to meet the requirements of Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C4 - No development shall take place whatsoever until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping (which shall include details of the gradients of the raised bunds as shown on Drawing No. 19514.004 Rev B) and a long term landscape management plan.

All hard landscaping works required by the approved scheme and as shown on the drawings hereby approved shall be carried out and completed prior to the first occupation/use of the additional parking area hereby permitted.

The soft landscaping scheme (including the proposed amenity garden serving the bungalow) shall include details regarding the type of trees proposed and their initial planting height of 0.5m across the site and the design details of the raised bunds whilst following the landscape design as shown on Drawing No. 19514.004 Rev B (including amenity garden serving the bungalow). The soft landscaping scheme shall be carried out as approved and before the end of the first planting and seeding season following first use of the additional parking area as shown on Drawing 201304/PL/505 Rev G (to the north east of the existing soil bank) or completion of the development, whichever is sooner.

The Landscape Management Plan shall include the management responsibilities, maintenance schedules and commitment (timescale to be agreed) to plant replacement trees in the next planting season should any proposed tree or shrub of appropriate size become severely damaged or diseased. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved thereafter.

Reason: This condition is required to ensure the completed scheme has a satisfactory visual impact on the character and appearance of the area. It is required to be a pre commencement condition to enable the Local Planning

Authority to assess in full the trees to be removed and the replacement landscaping requirement before any works take place, and to ensure trees to be retained are protected before any works commence in the interests of the visual amenity of the area in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C5 - Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme, expanding on the submitted Sustainable Drainage Assessment Report 2052 Dated 6 April 2020 shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:

- i. a timetable for its implementation, and
- ii. a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation/use of the additional parking area and shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the scheme.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment and provide a sustainable system of water drainage and management to meet the requirements of Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM8 and DM9 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C6 - The development shall not commence until full details of all proposed construction vehicle access, movements, parking arrangements and facilities to restrict the generation of dust and mud from the site proposed during the construction period have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details should be submitted in the form of a Construction Management Plan/Statement and the approved details are to be implemented throughout the construction programme.

Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP10 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C7 - Prior to the commencement of any development on site in connection with the additional parking area, full details of all external lighting including details of the position, height, design, spillage and intensity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall thereafter be installed only in accordance with the approved details and no further external lighting to the additional parking area shall be installed thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity and to meet the requirements of Policies CP1, CP9 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM6 and DM9 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C8 - Prior to the first use of the additional parking area hereby permitted and as shown on Drawing 201304/PL/505 Rev G (to the north east of the existing soil bank) the proposed access, on-site car parking and turning areas shall be laid out, demarcated, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plans and retained thereafter available for that specific use only.

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM13 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C9 - The new garden serving the existing bungalow, as shown on Drawing No. 201304/PL/505 Rev G shall be permanently maintained as an amenity area serving the bungalow only.

Reason: To ensure a good quality of amenity for current and future occupants, and to realise landscaping and biodiversity gains from the proposal, in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP11 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM2, DM6 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C10 - Unless specified on the approved plans, all new works to construct the dormer windows hereby approved, or making good to the retained fabric of the dwelling, 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 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).

C11 - No vehicular movements shall occur within the additional parking area hereby permitted and as shown on Drawing 201304/PL/505 Rev G (to the north east of the existing soil bank) outside the hours of 06:00 and 19:00 Mondays to Fridays (inclusive) and 08:00-19:00 Saturdays and no vehicular movements whatsoever shall occur on Sundays or Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM9 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C12 - The vehicular access to Oxhey Lane shall only be used in the event of an emergency and at no other time.

Reason: To safeguard highway safety and the free flow of traffic in accordance with Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM13 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C13 - The parking area hereby permitted and as shown on Drawing 201304/PL/505 Rev G (to the north east of the existing soil bank) shall be used solely in connection with the business operating from The Paddock and for no other purpose.

Reason: In granting this permission the Local Planning Authority has had regard to the special circumstances of the case and the need to safeguard the amenities of the Green Belt and the surrounding areas in accordance with Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP6, CP8, CP9, CP10, CP11 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy SA1 of the Site Allocations Local Development Document (adopted November 2014) and Policies DM1, DM2, DM4, DM6, DM7, DM8, DM9, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

PC 08/20 20/0889/FUL – Erection of front gates and alterations to existing driveway at MAPESBURY, SANDY LANE, NORTHWOOD, HA6 3HA

Councillor Debbie Morris left the meeting.

The Planning Officer had no further updates on the application.

Councillor Steve Drury asked about the drainage channel shown on the proposed plans and asked if there was any particular reason for that. The Planning Officer said they would be adding drainage just to ensure that there was appropriate drainage and no run off to adjacent highway.

Councillor Peter Getkahn moved the recommendation that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the officer report, seconded by Councillor Sarah Nelmes.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 8 For, 1 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the Conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

Councillor Debbie Morris rejoined the virtual meeting.

PC 09/20 20/0904/FUL: Single storey side extension at 34 THOMPSON WAY, MILL END, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 8GP

The Planning Officer reported that there was no further update.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the officer report.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Officer report.

CHAIR