
PLANNING COMMITTEE**MINUTES**

For a virtual/remote meeting held on Thursday 15 October 2020 at 7.30pm to 21.45pm

Councillors present:

Councillors:-

Chris Lloyd (Chair)

Raj Khuroya (Vice-Chair)

Sara Bedford

Steve Drury

Phil Williams (substitute for Cllr Peter

Getkahn)

Keith Martin

Marilyn Butler

Stephen King

Debbie Morris

David Raw

Alison Scarth

Also in attendance: Councillors Reena Ranger and Alex Hayward.

Officers: Adam Ralton, Claire Westwood Freya Clewley, Lauren Edwards, Scott Volker, Tom Norris, Geof Muggeridge, Kimberley Rowley, Sarah Haythorpe and Jo Welton.

PC 38/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peter Getkahn, with Councillor Phil Williams as the named substitute.

PC 39/20 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10 September 2020 were confirmed as a correct record by the Committee and would be signed by the Chair of the meeting.

PC 40/20 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

PC 41/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Chris Lloyd 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 Steve Drury declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item number 9 as he knew the relations of one of the applicants (20/1619/FUL - Demolition of existing bungalow and garage building and construction of relocated two storey detached house with associated hard standing, including land level alterations and front boundary treatment at 8 ARMITAGE CLOSE, LOUDWATER) and left the meeting during the consideration of this application.

PC 42/20 20/1037/FUL & 20/1773/LBC - Installation of security gates at stone arch at Batchworth Lane entrance and installation of rising bollard, turning areas and fencing on estate road towards the Moor Lane entrance to golf club at MOOR PARK GOLF CLUB, BATCHWORTH HEATH, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 1QN

The Planning Officer reported the following two updates:

Update 1: Moor Park 1958 had submitted a letter of objection. Their specific concerns were in relation to what they consider to be unresolved highways matters. They had concerns over traffic disruption resulting from the development namely traffic trailing back onto the junction with Batchworth Heath. They consider vehicles would be unable to gain entry and would have to turn in a tight space or reverse back onto the road. The land that would be used for turning was not owned by the applicant. They note that Herts County Highways (HCH) had raised no objection but requested details to be provided as to how vehicles are able to turn around at the gate to exit in a forward gear and that this had not been provided. Moor Park 1958 stated they were surprised and their concerns were that HCH were being overruled because Officers considered that, although at a premium there was space to manoeuvre and turn around.

Update 2: Additional information about the gates/bollards had been published online shortly before the meeting: whilst matters of private rights of access fell outside the remit of planning control, Officers considered that it was, in this instance, useful to seek some level of clarification over how the gates and bollards were intended to be operated.

Officers therefore requested further information from the applicant regarding the operation of the gates and bollards. This information was set out in a document that was uploaded to each application since the Committee report was published. The details provided some informal clarification and background information on the proposed operation of the gates/bollards. Whilst the information was useful, it was not considered that the information provided ultimate clarification or decision as to the how the gates would operate. For this reason, although it had been uploaded, Officers wished to clarify that it was not formally accepted as part of the application.

In light of this, Officers consider that it may therefore be appropriate to include a condition requiring the submission of a formal detailed operational management plan. This condition would require full details of the operation of the gates and bollards to be submitted for approval before any works take place. This condition would be attached to the full application but would not be applicable for the Listed Building Consent.

Councillor Debbie Morris said there were concerns regarding the lack of turning space through the arch. The report at Paragraph 3.1.2 stated that Herts Highways had requested that they needed details on how vehicles would turn around prior to a planning decision being made. Whilst Officers had taken their own view,

Councillor Morris would like to know how delivery vehicles would turn around if they turned up at an unsociable hour given that Moor Park hold a number of functions. Batchworth Heath was a busy junction and there was often a tailback of traffic down Batchworth Lane. Councillor Morris was concerned that vehicles would damage the grass or back out onto Batchworth Lane which would be extremely hazardous.

Councillor Raj Khiroya noted that originally Moor Park 1958 had no objection, however a subsequent letter dated 9 October raised some important questions, particularly regarding traffic congestion, with which Councillor Khiroya also had concerns and wanted to hear what the speakers had to say.

The Chair also had concerns and wanted the speakers to address, if appropriate, whether the applicant had been in discussion with the residents. Depending on what the applicant was trying to achieve perhaps bollards could be utilised below where the residential road was. That junction was very busy and the Chair understood both Councillor's and the residents association's concerns.

Councillor Steve Drury said that there did not seem to be a lot of dialogue between Moor Park Golf Club, Moor Park (1958) Ltd and the local residents, and was concerned about the Officer updates. There needed to be more clarification in the report and wanted to defer both the applications until there was more dialogue between Moor Park Golf Club, Moor Park (1958) Ltd and the local residents and for the outstanding issues pointed out in the officer's submission to be dealt with.

Councillor Raj Khiroya said that clarification was needed and a decision should not be rushed.

Councillor Keith Martin said the Committee did not have the full information. Many Members knew this particular junction, how busy it was and how much traffic builds up on the road. It would be sensible to defer both the applications until we have further information.

Councillor Reena Ranger said Herts County Council had failed to understand how dangerous the junction is, and were not understanding of what was being proposed and the impact it would have. There needed to be some kind of solution in terms of turning and traffic management. Not only is Moor Park Mansion a wedding venue, where a large amount of vehicles enter or exit, it was also used for sports and recreations from the early hours of the morning to late at night. There was already competing interest at the junction in terms of general traffic and pedestrians. The Council should also have a cycling strategy in place for the area. The County Council need to fully understand what was being proposed. The bollards would be minimal but this is in the Green Belt and a Conservation Area which must be considered.

The Planning Officer said that if Members were minded to defer both the applications it would be helpful to have a clear understanding of the exact reasons for the deferral so that Officers can understand the comments made by Members regarding Highways comments and the additional comments from Moor Park (1958) Ltd in more detail. The dialogue between the interested parties was outside of Planning Officers control and not something that they would get involved with.

Had there been any consideration of an alternative location for bollards beyond Temple Gardens. Points had been raised with regards the matters on Highways safety, turning and the relationship with the junction at Batchworth Heath

Councillor Chris Lloyd could not remember gates being there and said that it had always been an open access. Putting gates back that had not been there for at

least 70 years would not enhance the area. There had also been significantly less traffic 70 years ago.

Councillor Debbie Morris said that in the original documents the gates had been removed around the 1930's upon construction of Temple Gardens. The point on Highways safety was correct but it was also about the aesthetics of the entrance of the arch. If the proposal was to make an adequate turning circle a significant amount of grass would have to be removed in front of the arch and to the sides, and this would impact on the Listed structure if posts were added to protect the grass, these could also impact on the listed building. More details were required regarding conditions of use as the document circulated that afternoon was not clear. It would be helpful if Moor Park Golf Club and the local residents could discuss the modus operandi of the gate.

Councillor David Raw asked if the Officers were confident that there was enough turning space and if there would be a traffic problem.

The Planning Officer said that as set out in the report they had considered that there would be sufficient space to manoeuvre and turn around and go back towards Batchworth Lane in a forward gear.

Councillor Steve Drury moved that the application to be deferred, seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya.

The Planning Officer sought clarification that the applications were being deferred in order that Officers could seek further clarification on the following points:

- Whether there had been consideration given for an alternative location?
- Further consideration of Highways safety implications, and turning space adjacent to the gates.
- Visual impact of any additional/required turning space and the impact of that on the setting of the listed building.
- Whether officers consider the installation of gates to be acceptable, having regard to the fact that gates had not been there for over 100 years?
- How the gates would be operated, including the submission of an operational management plan.

The Chair confirmed the above points were correct.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 9 For, 2 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That both the applications (FUL and LBC) be DEFERRED for officers to obtain further clarification on the following points:

- Whether there had been consideration given for an alternative location?
- Further consideration of Highways safety implications, and turning space adjacent to the gates.
- Visual impact of any additional/required turning space and the impact of that on the setting of the listed building.
- Whether officers consider the installation of gates to be acceptable, having regard to the fact that gates had not been there for over 100 years?
- How the gates would be operated, including the submission of an operational management plan.

The Planning Officer reported there was no update.

Councillor David Raw asked if the shared drive would interfere with the extension of the building.

The Planning Officer showed an aerial view showing that the extension would not interfere with the shared drive, and would not be in conflict with the neighboring properties.

Chorleywood Parish Councillor Zenab Haji-Ismail said that the planning history of this site was of concern. The building had been a workshop and was not built as a family dwelling. The property had now received permission to be a house. There was one contrived bedroom within the roof void but it was unclear from the plans whether it had adequate floor to ceiling height. It was apparent from the proposed plans that the bedrooms would only be served by skylights. Access to the site was dangerous and poor. The application should be refused.

The Planning Officer said this application was solely for the extension and not the consideration of any change of use. The two bedrooms would both be served by roof lights which Officers felt was an acceptable standard of accommodation and would accord with policy DM1 Appendix 2. With reference to National Space Standards Office, whilst the officer could not confirm compliance with these as it is not a TRDC requirement, officers do not consider it to be poor quality accommodation. With regards to parking this would be provided in compliance with parking standards. On the amenity space there was an area of 60 square meters to the front of the property and for the reasons set out in the report it was considered by Officers that the application be approved.

Councillor Stephen King asked if a condition could be added so that Permitted Development right be withdrawn so further development could not be allowed on the site to include the roof space.

The Planning Officer showed the red outline on the site plan which showed the building being right up to the boundary so there were limitations on any further building work being done. The site was not in a Conservation Area, but Class B rights could be removed in relation to roof extensions if that was a concern of Members. Councillor Stephen King agreed with the suggested Officer proposal for an extra condition.

Councillor David Raw said as this building was originally called The Workshop this implied that it was a separate area but the plans indicated that there was a doorway into the main house. Could Officers confirm that it was now a single dwelling?

The Planning Officer said the history of the site was set out in Paragraph 7.2 of the report. A Certificate of Development had been issued and it had been accepted that the workshop had been in continuous use for four years as a dwelling which meant that the time for taking enforcement action had expired, so it was lawfully a dwelling.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved that planning permission be granted, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd.

Both the proposer and seconder agreed to add an additional condition removing permitted development rights in respect of roof extensions (Class B of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the 2015 General Permitted Development Order).

On being put to the Committee the motion with the amendment was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being 9 For, 1 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be Granted in accordance with the officer recommendation as set out in their report, with an additional condition removing permitted development rights in respect of roof extensions (Class B of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the 2015 General Permitted Development Order) the wording to be as follows:

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 Class of Schedule 2 of the Order shall take place.

Part 1

Class B - The enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of an addition or alteration to its roof

No development of any of the above class shall be constructed or placed on any part of the land subject of this permission.

Reason: To ensure adequate planning control over further development having regard to the limitations of the site and neighboring properties and in the interests of the visual amenities of the site and the area in general, in accordance with Policies CP1, CP11 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM2, DM3 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

PC 44/20 20/1476/FUL - Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 20/0654/FUL (Conversion of agricultural barn into a single residential dwelling with associated access, demolition of stable and erection of a new outbuilding) at BARN SOUTH EAST OF OLD MILL HOUSE, SOLESBRIDGE LANE CHORLEYWOOD WD3 5SX

The Planning Officer reported that there was an error within the report. Condition C5 was missing its reason. The wording for the Condition was as follows:

Prior to the commencement of works, hereby permitted, additional section drawings showing details of the upgrading to walls, ceilings and floors, including details of insulation and internal finishes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: This condition is a pre commencement condition to ensure the historic and architectural character of the building is properly maintained, in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

Councillor Debbie Morris asked how the width of the existing building compared to the actual width of the proposed building. If the application was granted could an additional condition be added to ensure that the new building was not used as a separate dwelling and only ancillary to the principal dwelling?

The Planning Officer said the original barn had a width of 7.4 metres and a depth of 5.4 metres and the proposed building would be 9.1 metres in width with a difference of 1.7 metres. It would have a depth of 5.6 metres which would be an increase of 0.2 metres. Given that this was a new application if justification was given then Members could attach an additional condition that the new building could not be used as a separate dwelling and only ancillary to the principal dwelling.

Chorleywood Parish Councillor Zenab Haji-Ismail said Officers had satisfied all their concerns and agreed with the request for the additional condition.

Councillor Phil Williams said historically the building was a crest barn and asked Officers for details on the written scheme of investigation from an Archeological point of view.

The Planning Officer said it is a Grade II Listed barn and the written scheme of investigation was submitted with the application and was deemed to be acceptable. Condition C6 ensures that the development would be implemented in accordance with that document and should there be any archeological artifacts or items of special interest found then they would be reported and works would cease.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved that the application be granted, seconded by Councillor Steve Drury in accordance with the officer recommendation, with an additional condition requiring the outbuilding to only be used as ancillary to the principal building.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being 10 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Permission be Granted in accordance with the officer recommendation as set out in their report, with an additional condition requiring the outbuilding to be used only as ancillary to the principal building the wording of the Condition to be:

Prior to the commencement of works, hereby permitted, additional section drawings showing details of the upgrading to walls, ceilings and floors, including details of insulation and internal finishes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: This condition is a pre commencement condition to ensure the historic and architectural character of the building is properly maintained, in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

PC45/20

20/1603/FUL – Single storey front and rear extensions, internal alterations to offices at THE PAVILION, GREEN LANE, OXHEY HALL, WATFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD19 4LT

The Planning Officer reported that Condition C2 was to be updated to reflect the latest set of plans which corrected errors in respect of the position of the stairwells.

The application was deferred in September for three reasons and officers had set out in the report the areas Members had requested further information on.

In terms of the proposed use, the existing offices had no restrictions on who could use them and it was not considered reasonable or necessary that any restrictions be attached to the additional floor space which was the subject of this application.

In terms of the floorspace ratio, the total ratio of office floorspace compared to the remainder of the building would see an increase from 21% to 26%. However, it was important to note that most of this increase comes from internal alterations within the existing office area. There would be no reduction to the existing pub/restaurant. The proposed office area would remain separate from the pub/restaurant, with no internal link between the two parts of the building. Therefore officers considered this to be a separate planning unit to the pub/restaurant area.

The application did not seek to encroach upon, or reduce the amount of pub/restaurant space. Should such an encroachment be sought, it would require a separate application to be submitted. There was no permitted change of use from office to pub/restaurant or vice versa. Any such change would require planning permission and was not part of this application. There were no changes proposed to the floor area of the existing pub/restaurant part of the building or the residential flat.

Councillor Sara Bedford said there were concerns over the future use of the property. In terms of allowing these extensions to go ahead, they would increase the amount of office space as a percentage of the floor area of the building. A letter had been received from the applicant's solicitor indicating what was intended for the building. The owners had advised that they were committed to converting the property to a wedding venue and offices. It was clear that there was no will on behalf of the applicants to return this property to its original use. It was of great concern that the property would be turned into a use that the local community and Members do not want for the building.

Councillor Alison Scarth said that in the officer's report under Judgement of Material Change of Use it stated: 'The floor area dedicated to pub/restaurant use would not be changed as a result of the development and the subject of the current application. Therefore the existing use and facility as a pub/restaurant remains unchanged.' But from the plans there was no pub/restaurant, so that description seemed incorrect.

Councillor Keith Martin shared the concerns raised and was often stopped by members of the public asking what was happening with the property. The property was in a dilapidated state and had boards surrounding it. If the offices were developed some of these boards might come down. He wished the building would remain as a bar/restaurant to serve the local community.

The Planning Officer understood the comments on the future use, but Members had to consider the application which was presented before them. The front and rear extensions to the offices had already been granted permission, the floor space had not been increased and this application did not propose changes to any other part of the building. If part of the building was to be used only as a wedding venue then that would require a change of use.

Councillor Chris Lloyd sought clarification that if the property was to become a wedding venue and not a bar/restaurant they would have to put in a separate application. The Planning Officer confirmed this was correct. The function room element was a lawful part of the building so there would be an element of judgement officers would need to make if there was a change of use.

Councillor Debbie Morris sympathised with the comments made against the application, but had not heard a planning reason for refusal.

Councillor Sara Bedford asked if a condition could be added to prevent change of use.

The Planning Officer said that when a change of use happened in the past they had been date limited because it was difficult to predict what could come in as it was difficult to secure against all eventualities. The offices could not be changed to residential use without an application being submitted and there was no change on the rest of the building if this application was granted. It was not reasonable to attach a condition as part of this application.

Councillor Stephen King was concerned regarding the car park spaces. Having 97 spaces would leave there being 20 parking spaces less for members of the public.

The Planning Officer said that no concerns were raised at the previous Committee meeting and there had not been any changes put forward. As set out in the report the parking spaces proposed were acceptable.

Councillor Chris Lloyd asked if the car parking was a separate legal matter and therefore not a planning matter.

The Planning Officer replied that from a Planning point of view there was enough car parking to meet the standards. Whether there was sufficient parking for all the other potential uses of the building on the land around the building was unknown. Historically the car park was used by any number of users. For this application, Officers could only consider whether there was sufficient car parking for the relevant use.

Councillor Sara Bedford said that the allocation of parking was covered within the lease and therefore not a planning issue. Some of the spaces are for the use of local residents visiting the playing fields.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved that planning permission be granted, seconded by Councillor Steve Drury to include an update regarding Condition C2 to reflect the updated plan numbers.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being 5 For, 0 Against and 6 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Permission be Granted in accordance with the officer recommendation as set out in the report and with an update to Condition C2 to reflect the updated plan numbers.

Councillor Steve Drury left the meeting for the consideration of the following application.

PC46/20 20/1619/FUL - Demolition of existing bungalow and garage building and construction of relocated two storey detached house with associated hardstanding, including land level alterations and front boundary treatment at 8 ARMITAGE CLOSE, LOUDWATER, WD3 4HL

The Planning Officer reported three updates on this application.

1. A revised site plan and Arboricultural Impact Assessment had been received which now showed no land level changes surrounding the root protection areas of the trees to the north of the site. The Landscape Officer had confirmed these details were now acceptable and as such Reason for Refusal R2 in the report had been addressed.
2. There was an error at Paragraph 7.2.3 of the report which outlined that there was a void at first floor level. This was incorrect and there are habitable rooms within the first floor of the southern gable. However given the orientation and separations distances the proposal was still considered to be acceptable.
3. A further comment had been received in respect of the inconsistencies on the site plan. However the red dotted line was only for illustrational purposes and the existing block plan is accurate. The comments also raise an objection to the lack of detail in relation to drainage and surface water run off however Officers feel there was sufficient soft landscaping such that this would not be harmful.

Councillor Marilyn Butler was in favour of this application which was more modest and better considered than the previous one and more consideration had been given to the trees on the border. The surrounding houses were quite large and the proposed dwelling would not be out of keeping with the area.

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.

Ward Councillor Alex Hayward knew the area and thought the applicant had addressed the previous concerns and put forward satisfactory tree protection safeguards. If the application was granted permission it would not bring any harm to the Conservation Area and endorsed the applicant's passive build for the sake of the environment.

Councillor Debbie Morris said it seemed that the objections raised had now been overcome. The reason given for refusal based on the Conservation Officers comments of excessive scale, had been overcome as there were dwellings in the road which were significantly larger. Councillor Morris did not find the reasons for refusal justifiable and proposed approval of the application.

Councillor Sara Bedford said that this was a large scale change to the building and could understand the case Officer points. This was one of those decisions where Officers would agree that it was a balance as to whether the dwelling would be too big and bulky for the location or if it would be acceptable. Councillor Bedford's view was it was appropriate in that location and supported approval of the application.

The Planning Officer said Members needed to consider the application on its own merits and given that there had been a previous refusal it needed to be clear why this scheme was now considered acceptable and had overcome the previous reasons for refusal. Officers considered that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to a Heritage asset which in this case was the Conservation Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that where there was less than substantial harm this can only be outweighed by public benefit. As this was a single family dwelling it was not considered that public benefit outweighed the harm. Therefore members needed to identify firstly why this scheme overcomes the previous reason for refusal and why they consider that this proposal does not lead to less than substantial harm.

Councillor Sara Bedford said this application was now proposing a smaller dwelling and had overcome the previous refusal. In the case of the less than substantial

harm if at this point the smaller proposal would not overcome the less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area then the reason fell away.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved that planning permission be granted subject to conditions (to be circulated to Members prior to issue), seconded by Councillor Sara Bedford.

The Planning Officers put forward to Members the following suggested conditions:

- a) Standard time limit and plan conditions
- b) Samples of Materials to be submitted to and approved by LPA and Conservation Officer
- c) Works shall be carried out in accordance with the updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan.
- e) Hard and Soft Landscaping Scheme including details of new planting
- f) Works to be carried out in accordance with the Energy Statement
- g) Removal of some Permitted Development rights – Classes A, E and F (Extensions, Outbuildings and additional hardstanding)

Councillor Sara Bedford said there would be no harm to the Heritage asset by this development going ahead.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being Unanimous

RESOLVED:

The Planning Permission Granted with conditions to be circulated to Members prior to issue. The conditions being as follows:

1. 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.

2. Plan numbers

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3309.Rev2.SPC1E, 3309.Rev2.PLC.1E, 3309 REV 2 ELEV.C1D

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning and to safeguard the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policies CP1, CP9, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policies DM1, DM3, DM6 and DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the Outer Loudwater Conservation Area (approved March 2007).

3. Materials

Before any building operations above ground level hereby permitted are commenced, samples and details of the proposed external materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no external materials shall be used other than those approved.

Reason: To prevent the building being constructed in inappropriate materials in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM3 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the Outer Loudwater Conservation Area (approved March 2007).

4. AIA and Tree Protection Plan

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details outlined in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement prepared by Abbots Arboricultural Advice dated 13 October 2020.

The protective measures, including fencing, shall be undertaken in full accordance with the approved scheme 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).

5. Hard and Soft Landscaping Scheme

No development shall take place 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 the location of all existing trees and hedgerows affected by the proposed development, and details of those to be retained, together with a scheme detailing measures for their protection in the course of development.

All hard landscaping works required by the approved scheme shall be carried out and completed prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

All soft landscaping works required by the approved scheme shall be carried out before the end of the first planting and seeding season following first occupation of any part of the buildings or completion of the development, whichever is sooner.

If any existing tree shown to be retained, or the proposed soft landscaping, are removed, die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of the completion of development they shall be replaced with trees or shrubs of appropriate size and species in the next planting season (i.e. November to March inclusive).

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 LPA 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).

6. PD rights

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.

Part 1

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

Class E - provision of any building or enclosure

Class F - any hard surface

No development of any of the above classes shall be constructed or placed on any part of the land subject of this permission.

Reason: To ensure adequate planning control over further development having regard to the limitations of the site and neighboring 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).

7. Energy Statement

The development shall not be occupied until the energy saving and renewable energy measures detailed within the Energy Statement submitted as part of the application are incorporated into the approved development.

Reason: To ensure that the development meets the requirements of Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM4 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and to ensure that the development makes as full a contribution to sustainable development as possible.

Councillor Steve Drury rejoined the meeting.

PC4720

20/1748/FUL - District Council Application: Demolition of existing two storey office building, two storey stacked portable cabins, and existing single storey sheds and stores, and the construction of a replacement two storey office building with meeting space and ancillary facilities to east of site. Alterations to car and lorry parking at BATCHWORTH DEPOT, HAREFIELD ROAD, RICKMANSWORTH WD3 1LU

The Planning Officer reported that Herts Ecology had responded to the consultation, and raised no objections subject to conditions which were already listed within the report. Herts Ecology had provided some further guidance in respect of lighting, and it was proposed to include this as an additional Informative.

Condition C2 was to be updated to replace Drawing 219284-C-900 P7 with P8. The drawing had been revised to remove unclear annotations regarding the type of hard surface proposed.

The Environment Agency (EA) had provided further comments, confirming that having reviewed the submitted documents and given the previous history with the site, they were now removing their objection to the proposed development. However, as the site had highly vulnerable groundwater as the site was within a Source Protection Zone 1, and given the current use, they required a number of conditions to be applied to any planning permission granted. Based on this response, the Conditions would need to cover:

- The need to provide a 5 metre wider buffer zone alongside the River Colne;
- The need to provide a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with the contamination of the site;
- The need to provide a verification report demonstrating the completion of the works in the remediation strategy;
- The need to provide a monitoring and maintenance plan in respect of contamination;
- The need to produce a remediation strategy in the event unidentified contamination is found;
- No infiltration drainage is allowed, no intrusive groundworks, boreholes to be decommissioned in accordance with a previously agreed methodology.

On the basis that the EA had removed their objection, Officers were proposing that planning permission be granted.

Councillor Raj Khiroya supported the application.

Councillor David Raw asked if a Condition could be added to replace any trees that were removed, and these trees be good sized trees not small ones.

The Planning Officer said that the site contained 37 trees, of which four were proposed to be removed as they were not of high quality and were not healthy. Three of the trees were set to the back of the site and one at the front. Condition C8 required existing trees to be protected in accordance with a schedule which had been put forward and agreed by the Landscape Officer. Condition C7 required a Landscape Bio-Diversity Plan which would look at how Bio-Diversity can be enhanced on the site and could include additional tree planting. There was very limited space on the site for new trees to be planted.

Councillor Debbie Morris said it was not good that more trees were not being planted particularly following a motion passed by Full Council that we should plant one tree for everyone removed. If that was not possible on this site then they should be planted close to the site possibly the Aquadrome. In the debate at Full Council, a Member had gone further and suggested two trees should be planted for every one removed. Also were there any provisions for an electrical car charging point on the site.

The Planning Officer said although it was not a Planning Policy requirement they understood the concerns raised on the tree planting and electrical car charging points and would ask the applicant to consider these points.

Councillor Sara Bedford supported the application and the environmental good that would be done in replacing an old not very well insulated building would more than compensate for the loss of four trees.

Councillor Steve Drury asked if there was a maintenance schedule to keep the wood cladding in pristine condition. The Planning Officer said Condition C3 required details of the materials to be used to be provided to LPA and a maintenance schedule for those materials.

The Director of Community and Environmental Services said that Informatives could be added regarding the additional tree planting outside of the site. The building had been engineered in a way that it could be adapted to take electric car charging points at some point in the future.

Councillor Raj Khiroya moved that the planning permission be granted with the amendments proposed by Officers, seconded by Councillor Sara Bedford with two additional Informatives to be added regarding Tree planting and electric charging points.

Councillor Keith Martin was unable to take part in the vote due to lost connection therefore abstained.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being 10 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be Granted (in accordance with the officer recommendation in the report and as amended at the meeting) with additional conditions as recommended by the Environment Agency, to update Condition C2 plan number, and with additional informatives requesting the applicant seek to provide additional tree planting at the Aquadrome as there was not room on site(8 trees to replace the 4 to be removed) and ensure the building is prepared for the installation of electric vehicle charging points, and providing further guidance on lighting from Herts Ecology.

CHAIR of the meeting