
PLANNING COMMITTEE**MINUTES**

For a virtual/remote meeting held on Thursday 25 February 2021 at 7.00pm to 10.25pm

Councillors present:

Councillors:-

Chris Lloyd (Chair)
Raj Khiroya (Vice-Chair)
Sara Bedford
Steve Drury
Peter Getkahn
Keith Martin

Marilyn Butler
Stephen King
Debbie Morris
David Raw
Alison Scarth

Also in attendance: Councillors Margaret Hofman, Dominic Sokalski and Croxley Green Parish Councillor Chris Mitchell for item 7. Councillor David Sansom for item 9, Councillor Reena Ranger and Mr Craige Coren (Batchworth Community Council for item 10, Chorleywood Parish Councillor Zenab Haji Ismail for item 12, Councillor Alex Michaels for Item 13.

Officers: Adam Ralton, Claire Westwood, Scott Volker, Claire Wilson, Kimberley Rowley, Javier Garcia, Lauren Edwards, Geof Muggeridge, Sarah Haythorpe, Sherrie Ralton and Jamie Russell

PC 82/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None received.

PC 83/20 MINUTES

The Minutes of the virtual/remote Planning Committee meeting held on 21 January 2021 were confirmed as a correct record by the Committee and would be signed by the Chair of the meeting.

PC 84/20 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair advised that Item 11 (20/2563/FUL - Single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and alterations to fenestration at 10 HEDGES WAY, CROXLEY GREEN, WD3 3FA) had been withdrawn from the Agenda.

PC 85/20 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 Peter Getkhan declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 13 and would leave the meeting during the consideration of this application.

PC 86/20 20/2246/TPO - TPO 922 – 8 Dugdales, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth WD3 3JW

The Landscape Officer said that the Council wished to make the TPO but an objection had been received from a resident who wanted to remove the tree. The Landscape Officer had suggested that the lower branches could be removed but the resident wanted the tree felled. The Pine tree provided privacy, was visible from the road and contributed to the community value of the area and in its condition qualifies to be a TPO tree as the tree also provided habitat for the wildlife. The Landscape Officer showed photos of the tree to the Committee that were sent in by the resident and then presented photo's that they had taken.

Councillor Steve Drury asked the Landscape Officer if the photos sent in had been manufactured, because they looked contrived.

The Landscape Officer said they thought the same, because when a site visit was done the tree looked different.

Councillor Peter Getkhan thought the same and asked if the manhole cover was actually covering a manhole.

The Landscape Officer said that the photos were provided by the resident.

Councillor David Raw said when looking at the original photos from the resident it looked like a proper tree, and was shocked at the difference between the two photos, and raised concerns for the home owner regarding the drainage pipe/water pipe and if there was damage which could be put upon the home owner to have repaired. There seemed to be some confusion as to whether the manhole cover had just been placed by the tree along with the bricks. It was uncertain what to think, maybe we should investigate a little bit further and possibly ask the home owner to remove the lid and the bricks around the tree to get a good idea of what was going on.

Councillor Debbie Morris said that the Landscape Officer had mentioned that the damage to the driveway was small. Was there a possibility that the damage could increase and be exacerbated by the continuing presence of the tree.

The Landscape Officer said yes it could increase however, Officers did not know if the roots would grow flat (superficial) or deeper. The growth of the roots will stop or decrease the growth.

Councillor David Raw asked if permission to remove the tree could be given then the resident could plant another tree in the rear garden.

Councillor Sara Bedford said that planting a tree in the rear garden would not help with the amenity of the tree that's currently being provided to the road, to the houses around it and the path and saw no reason not to confirm the order.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved that TPO order be confirmed as set out in the Officers report, seconded by Councillor Alison Scarth.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said that if the owner needed work to the tree they could still apply to the Council even with the TPO order.

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

RESOLVED:

Option 1, to confirm the Order as per the Officers report.

PC 87/20 20/1858/AOD - Approval of Details: Demolition of existing college building and redevelopment for a residential development of up to 65 flats in a five storey building (Submission of Reserved Matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for consideration pursuant to Condition 1 of Outline Planning Permission 18/1034/OUT) at WEST HERTS COLLEGE, HOME PARK MILL LINK ROAD, KINGS LANGLEY

The Planning Officer reported that two further objections had been received since publication of the agenda. There were no new material planning considerations raised which had not already been addressed within the Officer's report. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) had provided their updated consultation response in light of the Environmental Agency removing their objection. The LLFA had withdrawn their holding objection and had no further comments to make.

Within the proposed development description at paragraph 3.2 it stated that the west flank wall of Pinnacle House would be a green wall. Condition C4 required details of materials to be submitted. However, the owner of Pinnacle House had advised the applicant of their preference for the wall to mimic the remainder of the building which was comprised of a mix of dark brown and golden buff facing brickwork. The applicant had provided details and samples of the proposed brick types to be used which would match existing. Officers did not consider that the proposed change would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of Pinnacle House and streetscene, or impact on the amenity of its occupants or future occupants of the development hereby proposed. As such the wording of Condition C4 had been amended to relate solely to the materials used in the construction of the proposed new flatted development and a new condition was suggested requiring works to make good the external facing west elevation of Pinnacle House to be constructed with the recently submitted materials only.

At paragraphs 3.3 and 7.9.6 of the report it stated that 73 parking spaces would be provided. However the spaces were numbered incorrectly on the submitted drawings and a total of 72 spaces were actually proposed – the same number approved at the Outline stage. This resulted in a shortfall of 53 spaces however officers did not consider this to impact on the acceptability of the development and for the reasons set out in Paragraph 7.9 of the report considered that adequate parking was provided.

The Waste and Environment Manager had confirmed that the refuse strategy plan and accessibility of the bins on collection days was acceptable.

Councillor Sara Bedford said that the building was too big and too high for that location and had concerns about its effect on the Green Belt. Regarding parking spaces, over half the flats would have 3 or 4 bedrooms with families living in them and it was unlikely that one car parking space each would be sufficient. Despite the proximity to the station people were unlikely to be commuting into London every day and would still have cars. There would be a handful of visitor's spaces

left over for residents use and no parking available on the highway. This was too big a development with too few parking spaces.

Councillor Marilyn Butler was also concerned about the parking issue.

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.

The Chair asked for a breakdown of the unit capacity which the Officer provided as follows:

- 20 one bed units, two persons units
- 45 two bed units, which comprised 9 x three person units and 36 x four person units

Councillor Debbie Morris asked for clarification on the site plan as to where the communal amenity area would be as the Councillor had concerns as to whether it was a usable space, although the private amenity balconies were usable, at 10 square metres. The Planning Officer showed the site plan and explained where the amenity areas would be and how they had been calculated.

Councillor Sara Bedford had not heard anything to overcome the view that this was too big and intensive on that site. Regardless of the balconies, the amenity space was ridiculous and there were not high enough levels of car parking. One per flat for a flat that could house four adults was not adequate.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Keith Martin, refusal of the application on the number of car parking spaces and the height and bulk of the building.

The Officer referred to Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was in favour of sustainable development. Officers considered that the benefits of the development outweigh the collective impacts of parking and amenity space but if an alternative recommendation was reached by the Committee consideration would have to be given as to whether any identified adverse impacts considerably and demonstrably outweighed the benefits of the development.

Councillor Sara Bedford understood the reason in favour of the presumption of development and why it should go ahead on this site. But as an elected Member of the Planning Authority in this case these were not overcome. The principal of development was established but this was too much, too many flats, too many storeys and too few parking spaces so was against this scale of development and on that basis this should be refused.

The Planning Officer wished to clarify with the Committee the proposed reasons for refusal: the lack of parking spaces and the distance between the development site and facilities and the height, scale and bulk of the building being overly dominant and prominent. (The full wording to be circulated to Members for agreement prior to the issue of a decision notice).

On being put to the Committee the amended motion to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being 8 For, 3 Against 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED (overturn of the officer recommendation) on the following grounds (the final wording having been circulated and agreed by Committee Members following the meeting)

R1 The proposed development, by reason of its height, scale and bulk, would appear as an overdevelopment of the site and an overly dominant and prominent addition in the street scene which would harm the character and appearance of the locality.

R2 The proposed development would fail to provide sufficient parking spaces to meet demands arising from the proposed number of residential units. The lack of off-street parking would, given the distance between the development site and the nearest local facilities, and the expected need of future occupants to require private cars, result in pressure for parking elsewhere on the surrounding road networks and adjacent land which would impact upon highway safety.

PC 88/20 20/1881/FUL - Demolition of existing buildings for residential development comprising two-storey houses and three-storey blocks of flats (160 dwellings in total), together with car parking, landscaping, and other associated works at KILLINGDOWN FARM, LITTLE GREEN LANE, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 3JJ

The Planning Officer reported 56 further objections had been received since the publication of the agenda. Some of these were from existing contributors, others were from new contributors. They had received a short video within an objection received today which showed a lorry on Little Green Lane heading towards the Baldwins Lane junction and struggling to pass a parked car. Highways matters had been considered fully in the Committee report. The neighbour at No. 5 Little Green Lane had also submitted further comments today, reiterating their concerns including in relation to highways matters, impact on the Conservation Area and the impact of the development (specifically plot 26) on their residential amenity.

The further comments otherwise reiterate objections which were summarised and addressed within the Committee report, however, there were a few points that needed to be clarified before moving onto further updates as they were raised in a number of the comments that had been received:

- Green Belt: The development site was not within the Green Belt. The site was an allocated housing site within the Site Allocations Local Development Document which was adopted in 2014, with an indicative capacity of 140-180 dwellings. The site was removed from the Green Belt when it was allocated for housing and the allocation has established the principle of residential development. It was only the area to the north of Little Green Lane where the attenuation pond was proposed that is within the Green Belt.
- Conservation Area: For clarification, the western part of the site was within the Conservation Area, the eastern part was not. The Conservation Area boundary would be indicated for the benefit of Members when moving onto the plans.
- Highway Works: The proposal included widening the carriageway on Little Green Lane (between its junction with Baldwins Lane and the application site) to 4.8 metres in addition to the provision of a 2 metre wide footway on the east side of the Lane. These works were fully within the extent of the highway boundary and would not encroach onto The Green. The Highway Authority consider that the carriageway would be of appropriate width to accommodate vehicular traffic and the Highway Authority had raised no objection to the planning application.

In terms of further updates:

Herts County Council (HCC) as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) had reviewed the additional drainage information submitted and had confirmed that they raise no objection to the development subject to conditions. An addendum has been published on line which included full details of the requested conditions. In summary, the conditions would require the development to be carried out in accordance with the amended Flood Risk Assessment; would require further infiltration testing upon installation of the deep borehole soakaways; would require a surface water management plan for the construction phase to be agreed; and would require a management and maintenance plan for the SUDs features and drainage network. An informative was also requested to advise that the applicant should contact the Environment Agency regarding any environmental permits required.

In relation to Condition C7 (archaeology), the applicant had suggested that as it would be a second phase of evaluation and that the condition should reference what and where these works were rather than being a requirement for a general Written Scheme of Investigation to be submitted. The Historic Environment Advisor had raised no objection in principle to this approach, however, the exact wording of the condition was still being agreed.

In light of the comments from the LLFA and suggested amendments to Condition C7, recommendation (1) within the Committee report was updated to read:

That the decision be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services and that PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED, subject to the conditions set out at section 8.1 of the committee report with C7 amended subject to agreement from the Historic Environment Advisor; subject to the conditions and informative as requested by the LLFA as set out in the addendum (Appendix A); and subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement.

Councillor Sara Bedford thanked the officer for the report, but had concerns about the highways access, with regard to the position and width. Would people living at the bottom of the lane be unable to park outside their homes due to yellow lines? Would there be room for large vehicles to pass without running onto the Green? Would there be pressure at a later date to widen the road further? If the road had a wide mouth to allow vehicles to turn in from either direction it would have a greater effect on the Conservation Area. There was a perfectly good access which would not involve getting that close to the Green. It was not at this time possible to substantiate a refusal on the grounds of highways because the Local Highways Authority (County Council) had said they were happy with the access. Councillor Sara Bedford felt they should defer the application in order for the Council to get independent advice from a Highways specialist as to the usability of this access.

Councillor Raj Khiroya supported Councillor Sara Bedford's recommendation to defer the application.

The Planning Officer considered the application to be acceptable on Highways grounds. It had been scrutinised by the Highway Authority. Tracking diagrams had been submitted demonstrating that vehicles could pass on Little Green Lane. It would not prevent the four properties on Dugdales from parking.

Councillor Peter Getkahn had concerns about the positioning of the attenuation pond and the impact on the Green Belt and Little Green Lane. It would have a huge impact on the Conservation Area.

Councillor Debbie Morris raised concerns about obtaining an independent highways report and what the expense and impact of a delay would be. Also the Councillor had concerns on the impact on the heritage assets and referred to

section 4.1.13 of the report where the Heritage Officer raised strong objections. The objections related to both the Conservation Area partly within and partly outside of the site and the 9 heritage buildings around the site. The objections stated that the redevelopment of the site would be fundamentally harmful to the Conservation Area and the Listed buildings. The harm was categorised as less than substantial. The Planning Officer had responded in the report that the less than substantial harm needed to be weighed against the public benefit. The social objective would be the public benefit, in the provision of housing and affordable housing. Councillor Morris thought that the numerous objections received on the impact on the village, wellbeing and mental health of residents, visitors to the site, everyone who works there, impact on traffic, noise and light pollution, pressure on schools, doctors surgeries etc would outweigh the benefit of the additional housing. The Councillor added that there was nothing in the report showing that, as a starting point, there had been a strong and statutory presumption against this development. This had not been overcome. The Planning Officers had not started with that, they had considered that it was just a material consideration. The Councillor considered that there was harm to the Conservation Area and the 9 heritage assets.

Councillor Steve Drury thanked everyone who had responded to this application and referred to Paragraph 7.10.1 of the report and the unacceptable impact on highway safety. The access onto Baldwins Lane was a very bad corner. The fire service had said the site was not suitable for them to access along Little Green Lane which would need to be widened on the east side which would be the Green. The Councillor did not think the measurements on the map were accurate enough. The grass verge outside Dugdales would be lost. The Highways impact and harm to the Conservation Area were both very important. If deferred could the Officers confirm that the speakers would be able to speak at a future meeting.

Councillor Marilyn Butler had concerns about the lack of attention to the listed buildings. What would the attenuation pond look like in terms of fencing and planting?

Councillor Sara Bedford advised that independent highways consultant had been used on a number of occasions. The cost should not be great particularly against what they were looking at on this site. It was important to get that information.

The Head of Regulatory Services said that there had been previous occasions where additional Highways information had been sought. If the Committee wished to defer the application they would need to be clear on what the deferral would be based on for Members, Residents and the Applicant. Any other concerns would need to be expressed too. The application could not be deferred on highways grounds and then other concerns be raised at the next meeting. All issues should be discussed at this meeting.

If the application was deferred on Highways grounds the Chair would like the County Council to meet up with someone from Croxley. There were concerns about a vehicle driving down Little Green Lane and also concerns about three new cuts into a hedge when it was essential for wildlife.

Councillor David Raw was concerned whether a deferral on highways reasons was going to work.

Councillor Peter Getkahn wanted to hear all the issues and thought it could be rejected.

The Planning Officer reminded Members that the Applicant could appeal on non-determination if the application was not determined this evening. Regarding

Councillor Getkahn's comments there had been some discussions in terms of refusal, specifically Councillor Morris' comment about the Heritage assets but the report set out why there were considered to be public benefits that outweigh the less substantial harm. It was appreciated that Members may choose to weigh that differently. Officers would strongly discourage Members from refusing on highways grounds in the absence of support from the County Council.

Councillor Steve Drury asked whether the Council could provide a brief for whoever conducted the highways survey or would they just have the County Council's proposals? Highways originally said Little Green Lane would only be able to service 100 houses. Now there were more houses the access should go through the garages in Grove Crescent which would make access to the site easier. The Councillor did not think the application could be refused on highways grounds alone but agreed there were other issues.

The Planning Officer advised against refusing the application on highways grounds as if it went to appeal the refusal would not be supported by the Highway Authority.

Councillor Debbie Morris pointed out the impact on the residents at 5 Little Green Lane by plot 26. This issue may be identified by a speaker as a potential reason for refusal. The Councillor agreed with the Officer's comments on highways issues and was prepared to consider proposing a motion for refusal but would not want any additional refusal reasons added to put at risk any refusal decision. Residents deserved certainty.

Councillor Sara Bedford said they could not refuse on highways grounds at this meeting. The refusal would get turned over at appeal and the Council may get additional costs. If the other reasons fell down at appeal they may be stuck with a highways access that many Members believe was not good enough for this site. That was why an independent consultant had been suggested.

Councillor David Raw said if Councillor Debbie Morris did wish to move refusal the Councillor would be supportive of this.

The Chair invited speakers for and against the application and advised that if the application was deferred they would get the opportunity to speak again as a one off occasion as there maybe additional information come forward.

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.

Croxley Green Parish Councillor Chris Mitchell asked for the Application to be deferred. The changes on Energy were welcomed. On the access it had been stated that a 4.8 metre wide road and 2 metre path would fit within the existing highway boundary and would not encroach onto the Green or any third party land. This had measured and it was concluded it would not be possible. Access via Little Green Lane would not be acceptable for this size of development. The sight line from the junction of Little Green Lane onto Baldwins Lane was very poor towards Watford. Any trees removed should be replaced on a like by like basis with mature trees not saplings. What metric was used to arrive at a net gain figure of 9.33% of biodiversity and did this meet the DEFRA biodiversity metric 2? The houses represent overdevelopment as stated by the Conservation Officer.

Ward Councillor Margaret Hoffman asked why the mitigation measures advised at the pre-application stage had not been implemented? A housing development alongside the lane would diminish its rural character. The pre-application advice

recommended reconsideration of the houses at the western side of the site which the Councillor said should be removed from the scheme. Plot 26 should be removed as it is close to the boundaries. Any harm shown to occur to the setting of a Listed building should be refused by default. The proposed road junction further undermines the setting. The site includes an off site field in the Green Belt for water attenuation. Part of the Green would need a new footway next to the lane in the Green Belt, outside of the application site. The vehicle access should be from Grove Crescent. The Councillor asked the Planning Committee to look to refuse the application.

Ward Councillor Dominic Sokalski was concerned that plot 26 did not conform to the requirements of the local plan. It contravened the 45 degree splay lines to the rear of the property at 5 Little Green Lane and was 7 metres from the boundary. This was unacceptably close, overbearing and intrusive on 5 Little Green Lane. The proposed removal of the hedges along the Green would cause harm to the character of the Conservation Area. There would be a significant amount of construction traffic which would overwhelm Little Green Lane or use the unmade part of Little Green Lane which would damage the Conservation Area. The Ward Councillor supported deferral of the application.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved that the item be deferred to seek the opinion of an independent Highways Consultant.

The Planning Officer sought clarification that the deferral would be in relation to a review of the highways issues and the impact on Heritage assets, the Conservation Area and Listed buildings. In terms of both the access and houses, the impact of the attenuation pond in the Green Belt and impact on the amenities of 5 Little Green Lane.

The Chair added that Little Green Lane was a key route within the footpath network in Croxley Green. The Chair asked to amend Councillor Sara Bedford's motion to ask the County Council to meet the Councillors on site.

Councillor Sara Bedford agreed with the Chair's amendment.

It was clarified by the Principal Committee Manager that Councillor Debbie Morris' proposed motion, seconded by Councillor David Raw, was not a formal proposal.

The Chair asked for the road width on the site and entrance to be marked out if possible.

On being put to the Committee the amended motion to defer the application was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being 8 For, 0 Against 3 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to enable the LPA to seek the opinion of an independent Highways Consultant in respect of the suitability of the access from Little Green Lane.

PC89/20

20/2132/FUL - District Council Application: Refurbishment of existing play area including the installation of new play equipment, soft landscaping and seating at RECREATION GROUND, PRIMROSE HILL, KINGS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE

The Planning Officer reported additional information had been placed on one of the drawings to confirm that the land would be restored where the play equipment was being removed.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya, that Planning Permission be Granted.

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

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

PC90/20

20/2236/FUL - Installation of two new staircases, including all associated platforms, handrails, alighting points, access point in to and on to the theatre and associated fencing at WATERSMEET THEATRE, HIGH STREET, RICKMANSWORTH WD3 1EH

The Planning Officer advised that since the report had been published, the applicant had provided further clarification as to the requirement for the new staircases.

The roof was currently accessed via a vertical cat ladder within the adjoining nursery external play area. The ladder did not conform to current safety standards, dating from the 1980s and was not conducive to a safe working environment for those needing essential access to the roof. As well as being of inadequate design it was now showing signs of early corrosion. In addition, it had been found inconvenient to enter the nursery play area to get to the ladder, particularly at short notice.

There were no plans to move the plant and machinery which was currently on the roof as there was no space or practical means to do so. Hence the requirement to have a permanent and safe access to the roof in order to regularly service these items.

The other ladder was for improved access to a plant room within the building, which currently was only accessible by an internal vertical ladder (unsuitable for carrying tools, parts etc), and to create an acceptable external fire escape from the area for any operatives working there. This was important for bringing the areas up to current health and safety standards.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked why the fencing was going to be higher than the current railings and for an explanation on the comparative differences?

The Planning Officer said the fencing would be higher. They did not have the exact measurements but it would be a minimum height of 1.6 metres and a maximum height of 2 metres to ensure a safe enclosure. It would be higher but would be set back from the highway and was considered acceptable.

Councillor Marilyn Butler asked whether this would compromise the listed building status of Basing House. The Planning Officer replied that the Conservation Officer had raised concerns about the impact of the development adjacent to Basing House and considered there would be less than substantial harm. Officers considered this is a public entertainment venue used by the local community and wider communities and was required to ensure the safe operation of the theatre so there were public benefits that outweigh the harm. In addition the location of the stairs on the western elevation and the location of Basing House in relation to

other modern forms of development Officers felt that whilst there would be some harm, the wider setting of the Listed building was already impacted by Watersmeet and the adjacent car park.

The Planning Officer further clarified that the fencing to the elevation of Basing House would have a minimum height of 1.6 metres with a maximum height of 2 metres. The fencing to the other side adjacent to the Baptist Church would be of increased height to approximately 2.3 metres. The Planning Officer did not have the exact differential between the fencing and the railings but this was felt acceptable in this instance.

Councillor David Sansom wished to follow the Conservation Officer's recommendation that the staircase on the west elevation was not acceptable and raised concerns of damage to the Conservation Area.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen King, the recommendation that Planning Permission be Granted.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being 8 For, 1 Against, 2 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

PC91/20 20/2314/OUT – Outline Application: Construction of twenty flats (Appearance, Landscaping and Scale reserved) at CEDARS HOUSE, SANDY LANE, NORTHWOOD, HA6 3EZ

The Planning Officer advised that the Waste & Environment Manager provided comments on the application stating that the service road would be unsuitable for large waste collection vehicles without causing damage. As such, reason for refusal three has been updated to include reference to inadequate refuse provision due to its accessibility.

Councillor Debbie Morris said if there were to be development on the site in future it would be essential for there to be more than sufficient parking provided. Flooding on the road would need to be addressed should there be future applications. Any loss of trees would be significant on the character of the road and would need to be replaced.

The two speakers registered to speak agreed not to speak on the basis that the recommendation was to refuse permission.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd, that Planning Permission be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer report.

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

RESOLVED:

That PLANING PERMISSION BE REFUSED as set out in the officer report.

PC92/20 20/2563/FUL - Single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and alterations to fenestration at 10 HEDGES WAY, CROXLEY GREEN, WD3 3FA

The application had been withdrawn from the Planning agenda.

PC93/20 20/2594/FUL - Demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of replacement two storey dwelling with loft and basement level accommodation and associated hard and soft landscaping works including land level alterations at YOGI BHUVAN, CHORLEYWOOD ROAD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 4ER

There was no officer update.

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.

Parish Councillor Zenab Haji-Ismail said that although there had been changes made the revised proposal was out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area and requested that the application be refused.

Councillor Marilyn Butler pointed that there would be a noticeable difference to the street scene and too much bulk.

Councillor Raj Khiroya noted that the direct neighbours had not raised any concerns.

Councillor Peter Getkahn moved, seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya, that Planning Permission be Granted.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being 6 For, 4 Absentions and 1 Against.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

PC94/20 20/2667/FUL - Temporary change of use of land for the purposes of external film production, construction of internal access track and associated works for a period of 2 years at WARNER BROS. STUDIOS LEAVESDEN, WARNER DRIVE, WATFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD25 7LP

Councillor Peter Getkahn left the meeting during the consideration of this application.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked the Chair of the Committee if there would be sufficient time to debate the application. The Chair of the Committee noted the time but wished the meeting to continue to debate the application and to allow all the speakers to speak and felt that there would be sufficient time and was happy for the meeting to overrun if required.

The Planning Officer reported four additional objections had been received, these reiterated the objections set out in the Committee report.

As set out in the Committee report, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) raised some initial concerns regarding drainage from the proposed access track. In response the plans were amended to propose a permeable surface to the access track. The LLFA had provided further comments requesting further clarification regrading drainage from the access track. However, in response and to avoid any concerns regarding drainage the plans had been further amended to omit the internal access track from the proposal. The Planning Officer displayed the plans

for Members to view.

The development description had been amended to omit reference to the access track. Similarly, Conditions C1 (temporary permission) and C2 (plan numbers) were amended to refer to the updated plan numbers.

The omission of the access track from the proposals did not alter the officer recommendation, however, it was relevant to note, particularly in relation to the Green Belt section of the analysis, that the access track was no longer proposed.

An additional informative had been requested by the Highway Authority requiring that any lighting be provided in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals' Guidance Note 01/20: Guidance note for the reduction of obtrusive light.

The Operational Management Plan (OMP) had been amended to provide further clarification in relation to the requirements for advance notification and / or prior approval being required from TRDC.

In addition, in relation to 'Night Shoots', the OMP originally required details of the dates and timings to be submitted to TRDC at least 5 working days in advance of the activity taking place. However, the OMP had been amended to require that details of any lighting associated with the Night Shoot is also submitted to TRDC Planning and Environmental Health. This is in addition to WBSLs standard neighbour notification process.

The OMP had also been amended to clarify that no structures or storage facilities would be sited within 20 metres of any highway or public right of way (it originally referred to no temporary structures) and to also omit reference to the access track which has been removed from the proposals.

In view of the amended OMP, Condition C4 needed to be amended to refer to the updated version.

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 Debbie Morris had concerns about the operating management schedule. The Councillor asked for the following to be moved from 'notification only' to 'notification and prior approval':

- Special effects, lighting and noisy one-off activities
- Temporary structures including set construction height not exceeding 15 metres (there was no indication as to how long temporary would be).

Also confirmation was required from Officers that remedial works would take place following earth works and surfacing.

The Planning Officer advised that there would be remedial works. The application, if permitted, would be for a temporary period of two years. Condition C1 restricted it to two years and required that the land is restored to its former condition. In terms of the special effects and temporary structures, if amended they would require 10 working days notification of and prior approval by TRDC. Officers felt the notification process was sufficient, however, the decision could be delegated to the Director to grant permission subject to those two amendments being made to the OMP.

Councillor Debbie Morris would like those issues to be addressed and would be content if the application was delegated to the Director to grant with those

amendments to the Operating Management Schedule.

Councillor David Raw asked what could be put in place to ensure residents would not be affected.

Councillor Sara Bedford advised that this was the far end of the site at junction 19 of the M25, where there were not many residents. There had been very few complaints previously. Warner Bros had brought many positive aspects to the area including local employment, use of shops and a children's nursery had been opened. It was very important for local people.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant would be willing to amend the Operational Management Plan in relation to the issues Councillor Morris' raised, specifically Special Effects and Temporary Structures, and would require 10 working days notification and prior approval by TRDC Planning and Environmental Health. The suggestion would be that the recommendation be delegated to the Director to grant planning permission subject to receipt of the amended Operation Management Plan.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Alison Scarth, that planning permission be Granted with the proposed amendment put forward by Councillor Morris to the Operation Management Plan but that the decision be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services.

Ward Councillor Alex Michaels' raised concern that granting permission would have a big impact on the Green Belt area. The Councillor also raised concerns that both Members and Officers were too close to Warner Bros. The Ward Councillor felt that harm to the Green Belt would not be acceptable.

Councillor Steve Drury stated that they had only ever been to Warner Bros Studio to attend a Joint Leadership Team awayday meeting once.

Councillor Sara Bedford was sure there was no suggestion that anyone would not have declared any hospitality they may have received at Warner Bros. Many local residents had said they support local employers and the facility. The studio had really put the area on the map and people were proud of it. The comments were not representative of the residents of the area. It would not be visible from anywhere. They were a local success story within the Three Rivers area.

Councillor Stephen King had never been to Warner Bros Studio and supported the application.

Councillors Keith Martin, David Raw, Debbie Morris and Raj Kihroya also advised that they had never been to the Warner Bros Studio.

The Planning Officer confirmed the details of the motion to the Committee that the decision be delegated to the Director to grant planning permission subject to the receipt of an amended Operational Management Plan to pick up on the two points discussed. Members were reminded that conditions C1 and C2 were amended to reflect revision to the plan numbers and also the additional lighting that the Highway Authority had requested.

On being put to the Committee the motion with the amendments was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report and with the final decision delegated to

the Director for Community and Environmental Services to first seek changes to the terms of the Operational Management Plan.

C1 (temporary permission), C2 (plans) and C4 (OMP) amended to reflect amended plans and OMP.

Additional informative regarding lighting

Councillor Peter Getkahne returned to the meeting.

PC95/20 MOTION TO ADJOURN/RECONVENE THE MEETING

The Chair moved, duly seconded, that the meeting be adjourned to Reconvene on Thursday 4 March 2021 at 7pm to consider the applications at 14, 15, 16 and 17. Members requested that the start time of the meeting be 7.30pm. The Chair also moved, duly seconded, that Abbots Langley Parish Council be contacted by Officers regarding items 14, 15, 16 and 17 to check whether they still required these items to be called in.

On being put to the Committee the Chair declared the motion CARRIED that the meeting be adjourned to reconvene on Thursday 4 March at 7.30pm and that Officers contact the Parish Council to check whether they still required the applications to be called in.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there had been no objections from neighbours so would speak to the Parish Council and if they were happy to withdraw the call-ins the suggestion was that they would be determined under delegated powers.

RESOLVED:

That the Planning meeting be adjourned to reconvene on Thursday 4 March at 7.30pm to consider the applications at items 14, 15, 16 and 17 and that Officers contact the Parish Council to check whether they still required the applications to be called in.

CHAIR