Planning Committee
13th November 2014

Updates

Item 1

14/1248/FUL

Land Rear Of 12-14 Oundle Avenue, Bushey

Additional objection received in respect of the amended plans it is noted that no new issues have been raised from previous objections –

Summarised as follows –

- The bungalow is extremely large and therefore taking up a great amount of the area of the two gardens i.e. greenland. It is certainly out of character with the surrounding bungalows.
- It encroaches extremely close to the boundary of 16 Oundle Ave.
- Concerns about the build-up of water during heavy rain falls which could cause great problems for the drainage system and the possibility of potential flooding.
- The removal of trees/shrubs as well as the excavations for the foundations of the property would most certainly kill the roots of our trees and shrubs which we have nurtured and spent a great deal of time and money on over many years.
- The parking space for two parked vehicles are extremely close to the boundary fence of 16 Oundle Ave.
- There is still the issue of a wide enough path for emergency vehicle access, together with an adequate turning circle. No’s 12 & 14 Oundle Avenue would still open their front doors directly onto the new footpath which would be extremely dangerous.

Item 2

14/1111/FUL

Land South Of Elstree And Borehamwood Station And Adjacent To Coleridge Way And Byron Avenue, Borehamwood

Condition 26.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

Plan numbers:

- Block Plan – Drawing Ref: L100;
- Site Layout Plan – Drawing Ref: P.500;
- Site Layout Plan including Watercourse – Drawing Ref: P.100 Rev C;
- Detailed Site Plan (Sheet 1 of 3) – Drawing Ref: P.101 C;
- Detailed Site Plan (Sheet 2 of 3) – Drawing Ref: P.102 C;
10.64 The application was reviewed by the Council Parks Officer who made the following comment:

“There is none proposed on site which in theory is reasonable as our play area at Byron Avenue is less than 200m walk away from the nearest access point and if the play area proposed for the open space in Wordsworth Gardens is ever installed this would be approximately 300m walk.

However, due to the size of the play area at Byron Avenue and close proximity to neighbouring households the feasibility of any additional improvements are currently very limited. In order to accommodate the increase in usage and requirements the solution would be to extend the size of the play area – although in order to adhere to our own recommendations as to not encroach onto the existing households this would mean going into Woodcock Hill Village Green (if an agreement to use part of that land cannot be reached with the trustees than compulsory purchasing the land will have to be investigated).”
10.65 The agent has had discussions with the Parks and Projects Team and has agreed a suitable contribution of £150,000 for an off-site play provision. Given this contribution it is considered that the open space and play provision provided for the development are reasonable and acceptable.

Email from –

Andrew Lewis - received 12/11/2014.
Resident of Wordsworth Gardens And Chair of Elstree & Borehamwood Residents Association

Dear Mr. Eagle & Ms Silver,

I have recently read the report on the Hertsmere Council website in relation to the objections it has been stated that there were only 11, however, there were in fact 59 objections submitted back in March /April to the policy and transport team with a list of different objections.

Some of objections which have not been added and are crucial to the meeting:
Cracks appearing in people’s homes as result of train vibrations (picture evidence can be provided).
Subsidence occurring in people’s back gardens.

I will be bringing these items up on Thursday evening.

The application was submitted 2nd of May 2014 so these objections were received before the application was submitted. These objections related to the Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014 for residential development of 50 units (Policy SADM1, Site H3).

Item 3

14/1149/FUL

1 -21 High Firs, Gills Hill, Radlett

A further 31 letters of objection and 19 letters of support have been received as a result of re-consultation for the amended plans. The objections received are all confirming that they still wish to object to the development and no new substantive issues have been raised.

Aldenham Parish Council confirm that they still wish to object to the development for the reasons set out in the Officers report.
Item 4

14/0584/FUL

199 Watling Street, Radlett, Hertfordshire
WD7 7NQ

Further Traffic Engineer comments-

"Loading facilities at 199 Watling Street proposed development site
There is an area outside the neighbouring property that is designated as “Loading Only”. This is large enough to accommodate commercial goods vehicles, so they would not have to unload on the junction or on the zigzags adjacent to the pedestrian crossing. The Parking Standards SPD does not set any required level of provision for delivery vehicles, but the presence of this space immediately adjacent specifically for loading and unloading exceeds provision at many existing retail units and is considered acceptable.

Any vehicle that illegally stops within the controlled area of the pedestrian crossing to unload, or otherwise contravenes the local restrictions on waiting, or more general rules on driving, waiting, loading and unloading would be subject to enforcement in the normal manner by the relevant body, whether Hertsmere Borough Council or the Police. It will be for the eventual occupiers of any retail units constructed to ensure that their deliveries are made in a safe and legal manner, and responsible retailers will consider this before occupying new premises.

It should be noted that a review of parking restrictions in Radlett is scheduled to begin in 2015, and this would give the opportunity to address any additions or adjustments to local parking restrictions that may be required, such as for example any new loading restrictions or changes to the hours in which permit parking operates. Given the presence of existing retail and residential properties in the immediate area, it is not anticipated that significant alterations would be required. However, the content of any changes would depend on the findings of this review, and no particular possibilities have been ruled in or out at this stage."

Item 5

14/1544/FUL

2 Loom Lane, Radlett, Hertfordshire, WD7 8AD

2 further letters of objection have been received since the committee report was published. No new matters, to those already detailed in report, have been raised.
Item 6

14/1186/FUL

Land Rear of 15-17 London Road, Bushey, Hertfordshire

Planning Debrief

Elected members have requested further information on the following:

- Parking comparison with existing site;
- Justification for A1 pharmacy in Green Belt.

Agent comments

Parking comparison with existing site

The agent has confirmed that there are 53 car parking spaces on site (including the overflow car park which is accessed along a long path involving VERY steep steps, so quite unsuitable for many patients).

The total need for the existing site according to the Car Parking Standards SPD 2014 is 70. This is broken up into:

- Attenborough and Manor View surgeries have 14 consulting rooms (require 42 spaces).
- There are 17 non consulting staff (require 17 spaces).
- Total for surgeries = 59 spaces.

- Ground floor use have 3 consulting rooms (require 9 spaces)
- 2 non consulting staff (require 2 spaces)

- Total needed for ground floor = 11 spaces

This equates to 17 car parking spaces less than maximum standard.

Case Officer comments

There is an existing shortfall in car parking provision at the (old) Medical Centre. The proposed car parking is outlined in full within the committee report. There is a shortfall in car parking provision; however justification has been provided by the agent within this update. A condition has also been recommended for a revised car parking plan as it is considered that there is sufficient space within the application site to meet the full car parking provision. This condition to be included is:

Prior to commencement of works, a revised car parking plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Justification for A1 pharmacy in green belt.

The agent has provided additional justification for the reason to why the A1 pharmacy is within the Green Belt.

- Integral to the viability of scheme;
- NPPF does not seek to prevent competition;
- Pharmacy provides valuable medical services - they give advice on a range of medical issues and will have a consulting room, where blood tests etc could take place. They will work with the doctors to provide an enhanced range of medical services. Pharmacies promote health and wellbeing and provide access to stopping smoking, sexual health and alcohol support services. These services result in fewer trips to GP (who are also dealing with a wider range of services including services traditionally only provided in hospitals);
- The pharmacy will serve two practices, and will be a very busy dispensary;
- Pharmacy is not stand alone retail shop - it is integrated into the existing building;
- The retail element would sell medical related products - this is a very different position to allowing a general retail use in the Green Belt;
- Much more convenient for patients to obtain prescriptions on site, rather than having to drive elsewhere (causing congestion, difficulty of finding a parking space etc);
- Members should certainly not refuse the whole scheme due to this small issue - the fall back should be to attach a condition requiring it to be an D1 ancillary pharmacy, and once an operator is selected, they would submit details to the council for approval confirming how it would operate and the extent of retail sales.

Case Officer comments

It is considered that the principle of the A1 use is covered in detail within the committee report. The proposed A1 use is an ancillary use to the surgeries to which it is attached and comprises a relatively small floor area. Should permission be granted, the A1 use is to remain as a pharmaceutical use that is ancillary to the main building. (See condition 25 of the committee report).

Conditions

Agent comments

The agent has requested that condition 24 be removed from the committee report.

The agent has requested that under condition 5 that a post and panel fence is considered at the rear of 15 and 17 London Road as this would be less disruptive to their gardens as they won’t require strip footings at the top of the bank.

Case Officer comments

The Case Officer has discussed the reasonableness of condition 24 and it is considered that it would not meet the condition tests of PPG 2014. Therefore this condition shall be removed as part of any planning application approved.

The boundary treatment at the rear of 15 and 17 London Road has been discussed between the Case Officer and the agent following objections raised by 17 London Road.
There are no objections raised by the Case Officer to the principle of a post and panel fence in this location. However the height of this fence has not been confirmed. Therefore it is recommended the wording of this condition is retained as on the committee report.

**Plans condition**

To be amended accordingly in association with any updates provided.

**Highway comments**

(See separate sheet)

**Case Officers comments**

The consultation provided is considered acceptable. Conditions and informatives to be added as part of any planning application approved. A S106 contribution has been requested by the Highways Department, it is not considered that this is reasonable as the consultation response does not sufficiently justify the need for this contribution in line with the criteria of PPG 2014. Therefore a contribution has not been requested by the Local Planning Authority.

Appendix 1 to be included outlining the objections raised.

**Parking justification**

**Agent comments**

The key points are:

Parking for pharmacy - the committee report rounds up the number of spaces from 3.4 to 4 spaces, but the Council's Parking Standards SPD states that "parking requirements will be rounded up or down to the nearest whole parking space requirement. Parking for the pharmacy should have been rounded down to 3 spaces.

However, as the pharmacy will be used by people already at the surgery, question whether any parking for the pharmacy should be provided. People visiting the surgery would already have a parking space, and do not need a second space to visit the pharmacy (unlike the existing situation where there is not a pharmacy on site and given the distance people drive). To provide extra spaces for the pharmacy effectively doubles up on parking. Without this extra parking the total requirement falls to 100% provision.

**Case Officer comments**

The Case Officer has discussed this matter with the Councils Policy Department; it is considered that only 3 car parking spaces are required for the A1 use. Therefore one car parking space can be removed from the total shortfall in car parking spaces.

**Agent comments**

It should also be noted that the site abuts an area where the council accepts 75% parking provision (56 spaces required), and only approximately 175 metres from a very accessible area where the council accepts 50% parking provision (39 spaces required). This is
certainly a site where less than 100% provision would be acceptable in planning terms. Notwithstanding this, the scheme provides 100% provision.

**Case Officer comments**

The site is located within an accessible location on a busy main road with ease of access to public transport. It is considered that although the site is not located within an accessibility zone, that this is a material consideration within this planning application.

**Agent comments**

It should also be noted that the management of Attenborough Surgery, the developers of Bushey Health Centre, are committed to preparing an implementing a Travel Plan in order to reduce the reliance on the individual car as a means of transport and encouraging patients and staff to use alternative means of transport. There are already some clinical staff that cycle to work and it is likely that other clinical and non-clinical staff will do so in the future. This will reduce the need for parking on site (to less than 100% provision).

**Case Officer comments**

A Travel Plan has been included as part of the conditions included by Hertfordshire County Council Highways Department. As discussed above the site is located within an accessible location on a busy main road with ease of access to public transport. It is considered that this is a material consideration within this planning application.

**Agent comments**

Advised that the level of car parking also complies with NHS England and the Dept of Health requirements which suggest 69 spaces as being sufficient. The surgeries should not be required to provide more spaces that they actually need.

**Case Officer comments**

No comments to be made as not a policy requirement for this planning application.

**CPZ**

It has been confirmed by the Councils Senior Traffic Engineer that there is not a CPZ within this location.

**Item 7**

**13/2386/FUL**

Bridge Court, Mutton Lane, Potters Bar, Hertfordshire, EN6 2AW