

---

**PLANNING COMMITTEE****MINUTES**

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber at Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, on Thursday 26 May 2022 from 7.30pm to 21.02pm.

Councillors present:

Steve Drury (Chair)	Lisa Hudson
Matthew Bedford (Vice Chair)	Stephen King
Sara Bedford	Chris Lloyd
Raj Khiroya	David Raw
Ruth Clark	Stephanie Singer
Philip Hearn	

Also in attendance: District Councillors Stephen Giles-Medhurst, Chris Mitchell and Kevin Raeburn and Croxley Green Parish Councillor David Tobin

Officers: Claire Westwood, Adam Ralton, Claire Wilson and Sarah Haythorpe

**COUNCILLOR STEVE DRURY IN THE CHAIR****PC 01/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies for absence were received although Cllr Chris Lloyd arrived at 8pm during item 8.

**PC 02/22 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 21 April 2022 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair.

**PC 03/22 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS**

None received.

**PC 04/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chair read out the following statements 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 particular view.”

Councillor Stephen King declared an interest in agenda item 5 (22/0227/FUL: Demolition of a pair of semi-detached buildings and erection of two pairs of three storey semi-detached dwellings to accommodate 4x3 bedroom dwellings with associated alterations to vehicular access and provision of landscaping and parking at 167-169 HAMPERMILL LANE, OXHEY HALL, WATFORD, HERTS, WD19 4TF) as a member of Watford Rural Parish Council Planning Committee but was entitled to take part in any debate at this Committee on an application within that Parish area as the Councillor

- had an open mind about the application
- was not bound by the views of the Parish Planning Committee and
- can deal with the application fairly and on its merits at Committee

The Chair declared a non pecuniary interest for the whole of the Liberal Democrat Group on the Committee with regard to item 7 (22/0375/FUL – Part single, part two storey side extensions, single storey rear extension and connection of outbuilding to main dwelling, loft conversion including extension to roof, increase in ridge height and installation of front and rear dormers and construction of raised terraces (amendments to planning permission 20/0589/FUL) at PIMLICO HOUSE, HYDE LANE, NASH MILLS, HP3 8SA) Members of the Committee were not personal friends of the Councillor who was acting as an agent on the application and did not feel there was any conflict of interest.

Councillor Philip Hearn declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 6 (22/0242/FUL – Garage conversion and alterations to existing roof, loft conversion including increase in ridge height, hip to Dutch hip roof enlargement and front dormer window, front rooflights, part single, part two storey rear extension, front porch and alterations to fenestration at 120 WHITELANDS AVENUE, CHORLEYWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 5RG) as the architect for this application was also working on the Councillor’s property. The Councillor would leave the meeting for this application.

**PC 05/22 22/0227/FUL: Demolition of a pair of semi-detached buildings and erection of two pairs of three storey semi-detached dwellings to accommodate 4x3 bedroom dwellings with associated alterations to vehicular access and provision of landscaping and parking at 167-169 HAMPERMILL LANE, OXHEY HALL, WATFORD, HERTS, WD19 4TF**

The Planning Officer reported that the CGI image had been updated so that it now reflected the proposed elevations. In section 4.1.2 of the report the Highways Officer had noted that one of the swept path analysis drawings within the Transport Statement appeared to indicate a collision with a parked vehicle. The applicant had provided an amended drawing which demonstrated that this would not be the case and the Highways Officer had confirmed that the plans would be acceptable.

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

The Planning Officer had nothing to add.

Councillor Stephen King welcomed the report and was happy to see at Condition C21 that the integral garage would be retained. The Parish Council having seen the revised plans had no objection. The Councillor moved that Planning Permission be Granted in accordance with the officer recommendation.

Councillor David Raw asked about the comments from the Oxhey Hall Residents Association concerning the restriction on lorry movements and asked if the Committee should be considering this. Also on energy provision what were they referring to?

The Planning Officer advised that regarding the comments from the residents association on the lorry movements, the Highways Officer had commented on the application and put forward a number of conditions including requiring a Construction Management Plan which would need to be submitted prior to the commencement of development and would ensure this is covered and is acceptable to the Highways Authority. With regard to the energy statement the applicant had previously submitted an energy statement at the time of the last application to meet the requirements of our policy. Given the design had changed officers felt they should submit a new updated energy statement prior to the commencement of development to ensure it would be in accordance with our standard. The applicant had confirmed that they are in agreement to that pre-commencement condition so that we can ensure that sustainable and energy efficient measures are taken into account.

Councillor Raj Khuroya seconded the motion put forward by Councillor Stephen King.

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

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in accordance with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report and following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

Councillor Philip Hearn left the meeting

**PC 06/22**

**22/0242/FUL – Garage conversion and alterations to existing roof, loft conversion including increase in ridge height, hip to Dutch hip roof enlargement and front dormer window, front rooflights, part single, part two storey rear extension, front porch and alterations to fenestration at 120 WHITELANDS AVENUE, CHORLEYWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 5RG**

The Planning Officer reported that one further letter of objection had been received since the report was published and made comments similar to those provided in the report including concerns regarding privacy and parking.

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

The Planning Officer replied that there was an informative included regarding the verges. If the verges are owned by Herts County Council they would be responsible for ensuring they are returned to their original condition should they be churned up?

Councillor David Raw made comments on the fact that this was a bungalow and the applicant wanted to develop upwards. The supply of housing for older and disabled people would be affected by the loss of another bungalow. The development will affect the amenity and how people look at the property and was something the Committee should be looking at more strongly.

Councillor Raj Khuroya asked why there was no representation by the Parish Council at the meeting.

The Planning Officer advised that the officer report contained comments from the Parish Council and understood that they had written to Members this evening to send their apologies for not being able to attend tonight but had provided a short statement.

The Chair advised that in the statement the Parish Council provided they said they would be happier had there been a downstairs bedroom with an en-suite. The Chair pointed out that if you look at the plans that was already in place.

Councillor Sara Bedford said there was also a large demand for family houses in the area just as much as there is for elderly person dwellings and there is going to be a bedroom with a bathroom on the ground floor. People can move into a house and develop a disability which requires them to need downstairs accommodation. The Councillor could not see a planning reason for not allowing the development.

Councillor David Raw thought it would be out of character which was part of our planning policies.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen King, that subject to no new material considerations being raised, Planning Permission be Granted subject as set out in the officer report.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 5 For, 3 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That subject to no new material considerations being raised, PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

Councillor Philip Hearn returned to the meeting.

**PC 07/22**

**22/0375/FUL – Part single, part two storey side extensions, single storey rear extension and connection of outbuilding to main dwelling, loft conversion including extension to roof, increase in ridge height and installation of front and rear dormers and construction of raised terraces**

**(amendments to planning permission 20/0589/FUL) at PIMLICO HOUSE, HYDE LANE, NASH MILLS, HP3 8SA**

The Planning Officer advised there was no update.

Councillor Sara Bedford said the application was only coming to the Committee due to the architect being a Councillor and moved that Planning Permission be Granted as set out in the officer report, seconded by Councillor Ruth Clark.

Councillor Stephen King referred to paragraph 3.2 and thought the year was missing. The Planning Officer advised June 2022 was missing from the paragraph.

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

**RESOLVED:**

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

**PC 08/22**

**22/0394/FUL: Loft conversion including side dormer window and flank rooflights at 23 LEWES WAY, CROXLEY GREEN, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD2 3SN**

The Planning Officer had no update.

The Chair asked if the two applications could be taken together but on officers advice it was agreed to keep the applications separate and to have two separate votes.

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

Parish Councillor David Tobin wished to object as the development did not comply with CA2 of the Neighbourhood Plan and this further development would increase the massing on the site. The Parish Council supported the concerns of neighbours regarding privacy and loss of light. They wished to focus comments on the impact on the character and streetscene. The Neighbourhood Plan stated that developments should seek to conserve and where possible enhance the key elements of the character and appearance of the area as identified in Policy CA2 of the Plan. Extensions which have an over bearing or visual effect on the character of the area would be challenged. Owing to the position of the side dormer it would be visible from the wider street in Lewes Way. In the officer's report it is considered that the proposed extension would not result in any adverse impact on the host dwelling or the wider street scene but this is not accepted by the Parish Council. Reference was made to the previous planning history with an application in 2020 being refused and the reason for refusal which was upheld at appeal. The Parish Council believed that this application was not significantly different from the one refused in 2020 and wished for it to be refused on similar grounds.

Local Councillor Chris Mitchell spoke at the Chair's discretion on the application as all the Ward Councillors were Committee Members. The Councillor advised

that neighbours had big concerns about the application and those concerns/objections were provided in the report. They wished that the application be refused due to the effect on the character of the area. No streetscene elevations had been provided. There would be a total over massing of the site, there were privacy issues, overlooking and loss of light for the neighbours due to the increased ridge height, the rear extension and the dormer window especially for No.25. It would be unduly dominant and overbearing and the dormer window should be set back from the rear wall of the dwelling and it is felt it can be seen very clearly from the road.

Councillor Chris Lloyd joined the meeting. The Councillor would listen to the debate but would not vote.

The Planning Officer advised that a lot of the comments made were applicable to one application but not the other. This application (item 8) related to the side dormer window which is serving a stairwell. There is a condition included that the window be obscure glazed and the drawings identify it being fixed shut and obscure glazed to avoid any potential overlooking towards the neighbour. In terms of the second application (item 9) the officer would provide comments at that time.

The Chair confirmed what the officer had advised that this application only related to the dormer window.

Councillor Matthew Bedford said having read the report the application does comply with all of the policies both in the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan and was therefore struggling to find the grounds for which the application could be refused.

The Planning Officer reported that as set out in the report the judgement was that application complies with the Neighbourhood Plan and Development Plan and did not feel that there are any material considerations which officers would be happy to refuse the application on.

Councillor David Raw said looking at the proposed extension it looked like over massing and over bearing when you look at the front elevation. The Councillor did not understand why the Neighbourhood Plan and Policy CA2 was not relevant and was not being given some extra importance

The Planning Officer clarified that they did not say it was not relevant. Officers had considered the application against the Neighbourhood Plan and considered that the application complies with the requirements of the Plan and was why the recommendation was for approval.

Councillor David Raw asked if Officers thought there was over massing.

The Planning Officer said it may be helpful to look at the dormer window in the context of the building overall. From the front elevation, which is a flat two dimensional elevation, you can see the massing of the dormer but you have to remember that it is set back quite a distance from the main front façade. Whilst it may be visible you are not going to see it from many viewpoints only between the two dwellings. The triangle between the dormer windows is not right at the front of the roof as you walk down the road it is set much further back into the site.

Councillor Philip Hearn had looked at the application plans, visited the site and looked at the Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan and did not see any negative impact on the streetscene and moved the recommendation that Planning Permission be Granted as set out in the officer report.

Councillor Sara Bedford asked if there were any pictures of the street scene. Members were looking at a two dimensional plan and were not looking at what it would look like if you were standing opposite or in front of the house. If you were standing in front of the house the dormer would be pushed back so far you would not be able to see it. It looked like it was in line with the gable front but it was not.

The Planning Officer advised that there were no three dimensional drawings which would be helpful in explaining what the Councillor had raised. A streetscene drawing was provided to the Committee which showed the house to the left and right of the property and also the block plan which showed where the dormer window would be relative to the street and how far back it would be. There would be limited opportunities to see it from Lewes Way.

Councillor Sara Bedford seconded the motion.

Councillor Matthew Bedford said there was a suggestion that the ridge height was higher than the neighbour but looking at the drawing it does not look as if it is.

The Planning Officer stated that looking at the streetscene drawing the point of the ridge is only slightly taller.

The Chair stated that the report advised that the road slopes west to east but it actually slopes uphill east to west.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 7 For, 0 Against and 3 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

PC 09/22

**22/0414/RSP: Part Retrospective Demolish existing garage and construction of single storey and two storey front, side and rear extensions, first floor rear extension and alterations to roof to include increase in ridge height at 23 LEWES WAY, CRXOLEY GREEN, HERTORDSHIRE, WD2 3SN**

The Planning officer reported that the drawings submitted as part of this application were identical to the drawings that were submitted and approved as part of planning application reference 18/1680/FUL which is set out in the officer report. The reason the application had been submitted was because there was a question over whether the 2018 permission was implemented in time because whilst work started on it, as the applicant had explained, the works undertaken were not in accordance with those drawings. For the avoidance of any doubt and to ensure that there is planning permission in place for the works which are being undertaken this application had been submitted.

The house would be identical to the 2018 permission and plans and what the Committee were looking at was identical to the 2018 permission granted.

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

Parish Councillor David Tobin spoke to advise that the previous objections and concerns put forward for application 22/0394/FUL stand for this application as well.

Councillor Chris Mitchell said in 2018 when the application was passed the Neighbourhood Plan was not in existence but is now and wondered how relevant that was. The Councillor raised concerns on bulk, design and impact on the streetscene, the ridge height, loss of light to neighbours and privacy and asked whether the Neighbourhood Plan was now applicable as it wasn't in existence in 2018.

The Planning Officer advised that in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan comment it was not in place in 2018 but is now. The report addressed that at points 7.7.6 and 7.7.7 essentially saying that the Neighbourhood Plan is now in effect and an assessment had been made against the plan and concluded compliance and an acceptable form of development.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said the Parish Council had commented on the previous application and wondered if this could be summarised. The Chair advised that the points made were those provided in the report.

Councillor Philip Hearn said it was very important to take into account the Neighbourhood Plan but the Councillor did not see what was in contravention of it and therefore moved that Planning Permission be Granted as set out in the officer report.

This was seconded by Councillor Matthew Bedford who advised that even more so with this application they were struggling to see any grounds to refuse it. If you look at the elevations it was very difficult to say it was not in keeping with the houses on either side. You could see it was slightly wider but that was not uncommon in the streetscene. There was still adequate spacing between the houses.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said this had been a long standing issue which had impacted on the neighbours. No matter what the additional ridge height is you are going uphill so for No.21 it is a bigger issue than No.25.

The Planning Officer advised that the ridge increase was 0.3 metres so from 7.8 metres to 8.1 metres.

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

RESOLVED:

That Retrospective Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

**PC 10/22**

**22/0424/FUL – Change of use from Class E to a Nail Parlour (Sui Generis) at 36 HIGH STREET, ABBOTS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD5 0AR**



The Planning Officer reported there were no updates but advised that the application had been called in by the Parish Council on the grounds that they consider the proposed use of the premises inappropriate as the services are already met as set out in the report. It was not the role of planning to stifle competition and Members will be aware that use classes have been broadened a lot in order to ensure greater flexibility. Officers believe it does accord with policy and ensures the vitality and viability of the town centre and is therefore recommended for approval.

It was noted there were no speakers registered.

Councillor Matthew Bedford advised on a factual point that the Ward was Abbots Langley and Bedmond and not Gade Valley.

Councillor Sara Bedford disagreed with the Parish comments. The whole point of a thriving High Street is that you have competition and this will bring more vitality to the High Street. At the training we were told that competition was not a reason for refusal. Having a business in the shop is better than an empty shop. The Councillor moved the recommendation that Planning Permission be Granted subject to the conditions/informatives set out in the officer report.

Councillor Chris Lloyd was happy to second the motion. The Councillor wished to point out that the Parish Council had called in the application but had not attended the meeting and asked officers to inform the Parish Council that if they are going to call applications in it would be useful and polite to have them speak.

The Chair advised that in the report the comments made by the Parish Council were included.

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

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

**PC 11/22**

**22/0480/FUL: Demolition of single storey side extension, construction of part single and part two storey side/rear extension, front porch canopy and single storey rear extension at 128 BALDWINS LANE, CROXLEY GREEN, WD3 3LJ.**

The Planning Officer had no update.

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

Councillor David Raw noted Croxley Green Parish Council's objection and comments that it is a landmark building (old Lodge House) and was concerned with regard to the windows. This property had got some extremely historical looking windows and it would be a shame if we are going to lose those windows which would impact on the character of the house. The Councillor wondered if it would be appropriate to put a condition on to ensure the windows are changed to similar to what has been their historically.

The Planning Officer advised that in terms of fenestration there was a condition requiring use of matching materials and the officer report acknowledges that the windows would be different which officers did not feel is an issue. With regard to the front fenestration if Members felt it was appropriate a condition could be added requiring details on the fenestration to be submitted.

Councillor Philip Hearn stated that the plans showed significant improvement to the visual characteristics of the building. There were some quite unsightly extensions and the proposals would make the site much more uniform and ethically better.

The Chair referred Members to Condition C3 on the works and that the new things put in would need to match the old.

Councillor Matthew Bedford noted the applicant's comments and that they are being asked to change it to look like the other properties in the area but the property is very different. Enhancing the original building would seem a better way forward but we need to consider the application before us tonight.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said the property was already looking better than it was. The Councillor had not seen the property from the back only the front. They moved the recommendation that Planning Permission be Granted as set out in the officer report. The motion was seconded by Councillor Stephanie Singer.

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

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

**PC12/22**

**22/0491/FUL - The provision of new sound stages, workshops, production and post-production offices, Studio support facilities (including new welfare and café building) and new roundabout to provide vehicular access to the Studios and Island Site; the construction of decked car parking and a pedestrian footbridge (Island Site); the use of land to the west of the Studios for film production and associated activities (Backlot 2); ecological improvements to existing field (Lower Field) together with site-wide landscape and necessary utilities and infrastructure works, bund construction, and ground re-profiling at Warner Bros. Studios Leavesden, Warner Drive, Watford, Hertfordshire, WD25 7LP**

The Planning Officer advised that report before Members is a Preliminary Report. It sets out the planning history, site description, development description, comments received to date from consultees and the public and sets out the policy framework against which the application should be considered in order to aide discussion on the application. The report does not assess the acceptability or otherwise of the proposal at this stage and Members are not being asked to determine the application. Any points raised/questions asked by Members will be taken away by officers in order to ensure that Members have all the information they require when they are asked to determine the application in due course. A full report will be returned to a future

Planning Committee for determination and any party who has commented on the application will be notified ahead of this meeting.

Turning to the development proposed. As set out in the report, the development is split between 5 main areas which are referred to as: Central Site; Island Site, Western Site; Triangle Site and Northern Access.

1. Central Site – The Central site would include the 11 new sound stages, 4 x 3 storey offices and 3 x workshops. The sound stages would range from 18m-21.5m in height, with the taller elements located within the site, away from the boundary. The offices and workshops would have a maximum height of 12m. It is proposed that offices face onto Gadeside in order to create an active frontage to the road. The Central Site would also include the south gate entrance tower.
2. Island Site – The Island Site would be home to the Studio Deck car park providing 2,500 spaces over 5 floors (including roof) and ranging from 11-15m in height, with the lower element closest to the residential properties in Ashfields to the east. A studio support building is also proposed and would have a height of 11m. The eastern part of the Island Site falls within Watford Borough Council's area. It is also relevant to note, as set out in the report, that the Island Site is allocated for Leavesden Studios Operations and associated uses in the current Site Allocations document.
3. Western Site – The Western Site comprises of two elements. Backlot 2 which currently has temporary consent is proposed to become permanent backlot space. The Lower Field is located to the west of the public right of way (Gypsy Lane) and no built development or change of use is proposed here. The submitted plans detail landscape and ecological enhancements to the lower field.
4. Triangle Site – The Triangle Site is where a new southern access roundabout is proposed to serve the Studio Parking Deck and main Studios site. A pedestrian bridge is also proposed between the Island site and Central site. This would have a road clearance height of 5.5m.
5. Northern Access – At the Northern Access, the studio north gate access is proposed to be widened to assist with traffic flow into the site.

In terms of updates since the publication of the agenda: We have received 1 additional objection. The points raised reflect those set out in the report at Section 4.3. Any further points made will be included in the report when it comes back to the Committee for determination.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the application and a member of the public spoke against.

Ward Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst was aware of the history of the site even prior to the construction on the site and had held discussions and attended exhibitions. The Councillor wished to bring to attention the changes of the height in relation to the Island site as it was not clear in the report what was originally considered for that site in terms of heights although it now stated it would be reducing in scale but this was not clear how much it would be reducing in scale and what the effects would be on the bunding and shielding for the residents. There had been no traffic impact study and no comments from the County Council so awaited comments on this at a future meeting. It had been raised that there is some congestion there but having been there as

early as 6 in the morning and 7.30 at night they had not noticed much at all. One comment which had been raised was the pedestrian footbridge the main access to the studio from the car park and suggestions were made on whether it could have a cedar roof to increase biodiversity and what measures could be provided to further increase biodiversity with the new constructions. The Councillor would like to see more details on the backlot and how that would be screened and how it would be seen on the slip road from the motorway. This is a major concern of local residents. They did appreciate the current temporary permission and that the amount of measures were more limited but if this was to become permanent as per the proposed application we do need to see some detailed visuals and how it will impact visually from a distance to see how this is mitigated in terms of that particular backlot. The Councillor would like to seek assurances in terms of the fields which had been raised by the Gypsy Lane Residents Association so that there is no further expansion in that area.

The Planning Officer advised that the purpose tonight was to get Members comments/questions so that these can be covered in the report when it comes back to the Committee for determination.

Councillor Matthew Bedford had a few points to raise. On the 10% biodiversity net gain their assumption was that would apply but it would be helpful if officers could confirm that.

The Planning Officer advised that when the report is updated they can ensure that figures are provided in terms of the biodiversity net gain and what would be achieved by this proposal but was not able to confirm at this time. In terms of the matter of biodiversity net gain one of the speakers had referenced the Environment Act which was introduced as a Bill in 2019 and had been enacted following Royal assent in November last year. The Bill proposes to mandate the requirement of 10% biodiversity net gain. At the moment the NPPF talks about biodiversity net gain as does our Policy DM6 but they do not specify the amount. What needs to happen for the Act to apply in England is for an amendment to the Town and Country Planning Act and this is unlikely to become law until 2023. The officer would ensure that the report provides more detail on this and on the percentage of biodiversity net gain that is being achieved.

Councillor Matthew Bedford said that the most recent public consultation on our new Local Plan did show the whole of the lower field as public open space so clearly the Council is minded to go down that route. A point was made about the Hunton Bridge roundabout being a view point which it was not as it was a monstrosity as is the motorway slip road so it was really difficult to say that we need to be over concerned about the view from there. The Councillor was much more concerned about the view from any residential properties which in fact were minimal or indeed from any public rights of way such as from Gypsy Lane itself where currently the temporary permission provided good screening along Gypsy Lane. In relation to all the new buildings along the side of the dual carriage way and the various slip roads that land was fairly elevated relative to the road and if we are now proposing 18-20 metre buildings on there then there also needs to be some thought on how that does not appear to be very imposing to people who are driving, jogging or cycling along there.

Councillor Philip Hearn said it would be useful if Members of the Committee could make a site visit and proposed this to the Committee.

Councillor Sara Bedford thought it was hoped that the report for determination would come back to Committee in July so we need to ensure that it was possible to visit Warner Bros site so that all Councillors could be made aware of the site to get an idea of the space and also the area outside. The Councillor supported the site visit.

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

The Planning Officer advised that they would ensure arrangements were made for a site visit prior to the application coming back to the Committee for determination. With regard to the date the report may come back the deadline for reports for the June meeting was only a few weeks away so it would not come back to the June meeting with the July meeting likely to be the first available date.

Councillor David Raw had given consideration to the details provided on the views by the public and residents around the area and asked whether it would be possible to have side views or 3D views which would give Members an idea of the type of buildings, the height and how they will look from the perspective of residents so that we can assist with details on the trees and the borders to hide some of the infrastructure. Coming down to the Hunton Bridge roundabout the Councillor would still like to see the trees to hide the buildings.

The Planning Officer said there were a lot of drawings which are all available on line and would look to ensure that the plans which are most useful to Members are provided but it was not possible to show all the plans this evening due to the volume but will look to make them more accessible to Members.

Councillor Sara Bedford said one of the issues was that many of the views were internal to the site and the view from Hunton Bridge roundabout depended on which direction you were coming from. Members needed to go around the outside of the site when making the site visit as well as going onto the site. Not all the details had been included and a full report will come back to the Committee to a future meeting with the hope being in July. Whenever this point comes up by email or in local groups there is a lot of local support for the economic benefits and the job benefits it brings to people in the area as well as some opposition. If you look at the planning history of Warner Bros and the Councillor would say this about any applicant in this situation you will see that there is not one application refused. The reason for that is not because this Council has a history of just giving planning permission to Warners in whatever they ask for it is because the applicant has a history of listening to what Members say and residents and amending their plans to meet those concerns or issues raised. The Councillor would encourage Members of the Committee and other Members to raise those concerns with the Planning Officer to allow them to take them up with the applicant and to get those concerns addressed because this had always been a successful route in the past. Comments made by the Committee, when the tour opened, were we didn't want parking on local streets and wanted a parking space to come with your ticket free so that meant there was no incentive to park on local streets because there were enough

parking spaces for everyone who was admitted to the exhibition. We also wanted time tickets as we did not want everyone arriving at one time so that it did not generate a problem with parking. Both of these points were accepted by Warners. There have been others but these are just two. If people have concerns we have to try and talk it through.

The Chair referred within the report to the planting they would do and where they were looking to increase the size and age of some of the trees they were going to plant but there were no details on how long they would be maintained for or whether they would be replaced due to die back. It was important that this is addressed in a future report.

The Planning Officer referred Members to section 3.10 of the report but would take away the points made.

Councillor Stephanie Singer said with regard to the trees when they are planted they are tiny and the pictures showed large trees so it would be useful to have an assessment of how long a tree takes to get from its planting size to fully grown.

Councillor David Raw said considering the historical nature of the site and the new build which is going to be put into place if it goes ahead is there anything which should be protected

The Planning Officer advised that there is a long planning history and a lot of archaeological surveys undertaken on site over the years and had always been considered and was a relevant consideration in terms of impact on heritage assets and any archaeological significance and is being addressed.

Councillor Raj Khiroya made an observation that there had been 44 objections and only 2 in support and felt a site visit was an excellent idea to understand the extent of the development and take into account the objections raised.

The Planning Officer would look to agree a route for the site visit and local Councillors would provide details of points to look at and view from during the site visit.

**RESOLVED:**

That Members undertake a site visit.

Noted there is no recommendation for approval or refusal at this stage in the consideration of the application.

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

Chair