



LITTLE GADDES DEN *parish council*

MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD BY VIDEO CONFERENCE ON
3rd August, 2020

PLEASE NOTE THAT MINUTES ARE ALSO PUBLISHED ON THE VILLAGE WEB SITE
<https://littlegaddesdenpc.org.uk>

The meeting commenced at 8.00 pm.

PRESENT: Cllrs. Hyde, Lawson, Kelly, Magson, Pritchard, Saner, Townsend. Also in attendance, Alastair Greene (Clerk), County and District Councillor Terry Douris, (from 9.00pm) and seven members of the public.

APOLOGIES: None

1. FORMALITIES

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained how the meeting would be run with open microphone for Councillors and muted microphones for members of the public until the public open question session.

The Clerk noted the attendance and recorded it in the register.

There were no declarations of interest on items on the agenda.

The minutes of the previous month's meeting were agreed as a correct record of the meeting and were signed at the end of the meeting.

2. OPEN SESSION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Cllr. Kelly asked if anyone wished to raise any matters not already covered in the agenda, however, no additional matters were raised at that point in the meeting.

3. REPORTS AND MATTERS ARISING

(a) Community Support Activity in relation to Coronavirus

There was no formal update but the general feeling was that parishioners were managing the situation well.

(b) Update on the Shop and Post Office

It was noted that the Odedra Family had received a Lord Lieutenant's Hero of Hertfordshire certificate for their support of the village during the pandemic. The Parish Council had supported the award and were grateful to all those working at the shop for all the hard work during such a difficult time. (Wendy Molloy and Sarah Gall were awarded a certificate too for their community support work during the Covid- 19 lockdown.)

(c) Report from Hertfordshire Constabulary.

The Clerk advised that no report had been received.

Signed by the Chairman..... Dated.....

(d) Land for sale in Church Road

A member of the public, Steven Kinson, who wished to speak about his Church Road application, was invited by the Chairman to present his application.

Mr. Kinson advised that he was the new owner of Plot 17 (the small area of land immediately opposite the Church and an adjoining area of land known as Plot Q).

He advised the following:- He and his wife were local, from Dunstable, and were familiar with the village and wanted to protect the countryside from development. He had purchased the land with the idea of using it for grazing possibly with Highland Cattle or maybe sheep. He thought it would be practical to relocate the line of the footpath and possibly put a stone surface along the footpath and create a new vehicular access from Church Road onto the land. He confirmed that he was the freehold owner and advised that when he put the application in, he was obliged to note any previous owners within the last 21 days, which he had done. Eventually his ownership would be recorded at the Land Registry.

Mr. Kinson agreed that the relocation of the footpath should be by an application to Hertfordshire County Council.

Michael Carver asked whether, since Mr. Kinson was not wanting to develop the land and to keep it for agricultural use, he would be prepared to legally restrict the use of his land by a covenant. However, Mr. Kinson said that such an action would devalue his land.

The Chairman asked Councillors how they would like to respond to the application. Councillors felt there was little justification for the proposals and unanimously objected to the application.

(e) Local Green Space Designation (LGSD)

Cllr Kelly advised he had not had an opportunity to progress this matter yet.

(f) Village Hall toilet refurbishment

The Clerk read out a statement of how the project had progressed since the last meeting.

It was noted previously that the relocation of the hall's mains electrical supply (from the men's toilets to the entrance lobby) would be managed directly by the Village Hall Management Committee (VHMC) and the Parish Council would manage the Toilet refurb.

I can confirm that the electrical supply/fuse boxes etc. have now been relocated and apart from some minor additional work proposed by the electrician we are free to progress the Toilet refurb.

Toilet refurbishment

I reported at the last meeting that we had split the work into three work groups, General Builder, Plumber and Electrician and had sought quotes from three contractors for each of those three specialist areas of work. Quotes have now been received from all parties, so I can confirm that we have met our Financial Regulations. Our proposed team are Michael Reilly General Builder, Steve Gates Plumber and Garry King Electrician.

The costs from those three contractors combined with currently specified supply of equipment is £24,000. (The final cost will be determined by our final choice of equipment). In order to reserve dates in their diaries we have asked them to pencil in a start date of 1st September and they have been advised that full go ahead will be confirmed following tonight's meeting. The lead time for delivery of equipment is c. 3 weeks so we now need to do the final selection of equipment and choose finishes/colours etc.

Signed by the Chairman..... Dated.....

At the last meeting it was agreed that the Parish Council would target £23,000 but gave approval to proceed with the project provided that £25,000 was not exceeded. Whilst we have been going through the process of obtaining quotes, we have modified our thinking a little. In particular we have decided that electric lights should be movement sensor driven to save on electricity but also to make it 'touchless' for increased hygiene. Further the urinals will be movement sensor driven rather than continual flushing (to save water) and the flush in the ladies' WCs will also be sensor driven for hygiene reasons, in effect making them Covid compliant. We have decided to hide the pipes below the wash hand basin in the men's with a wall mounted cabinet and the urinals will now be within a wall panel system to hide pipes and flushing mechanisms.

The hygienic improvements alone add c. £2,000 to our base cost but we (Paul Kelly, David Brattle and I) feel are the right solution particularly in a community shared facility and again with Covid 19 in mind.

The VHMC would like to replace the flooring of the lobby area at the same time as the flooring in the toilets and will fund all of this, helping to keep us within budget.

In our original spec we had allowed for standard quality cubicles but it is clear now that they would not be as solid as the current ones and we don't want to end up with a lower spec than current. We are obtaining final costs for those better quality cubicles and floor to ceiling wall paneling rather than wall tiles in some areas. Any increase in costs required due to a change of specification will be picked up by the VHMC, ensuring that we keep within budget.

Just a reminder that we are funding this work primarily from CIL. The Parish Council is in receipt of two payments under the CIL (£5,664 from 2018/19 and £11,968.55 from 2019/20) totaling £17,632.55. Although we have funds to cover the full £25,000, Paul Kelly is drafting a grant application to seek funds from Dacorum Borough Council to support the project.

(g) Projects to be funded

Paul Kelly advised that he had received a letter from the VPA who were concerned about a leaking roof to the VPA store and were seeking advice and if possible financial support for repair/replacement. Councillors noted the request.

4. ADMINISTRATION

(i) Correspondence not already covered above and that requires action by the Council

The Clerk advised that Wendy Molloy had written to the Parish Council as she was unhappy with the noise from machinery cutting the Green late one evening. Councillors noted her concern and the Clerk said that where possible contractors would be asked to keep to more reasonable working hours.

Sandra Walsham had written in complaining about the overgrown hedging along the road from Ringshall to the Shop and about the flooding at Beacon Road. It was noted that hedge owners were likely to be harvesting at the moment and will follow up with hedge trimming in the autumn. See later statement re flooding.

A resident had written in expressing concern about the proximity of the basketball net to the children's play area and asking about possible separation of the two areas. The Council decided that in short term the situation should be monitored and recorded and, in the meantime, notices

Signed by the Chairman..... Dated.....

erected reminding basketball users to be mindful of children playing nearby.

(ii) Finance

(a) The schedule of payments was approved together with the report on expenditure for the previous month.

(iii) Health and Safety

The Clerk confirmed that the monthly H&S inspection had been carried out on 4th July at reopening of the play areas and also on August 1st. Having noted a protruding screw at the recent inspection he advised that he had removed it and provided additional support to a ramp on the climbing frame ahead of ramp repair by DBC. Councillor Hyde agreed to chase the DBC team again.

Finance Schedule

a. The Council approved the following payments:-

Clerk & Village Hall Manager – Salary & PAYE for July/Aug

SRT Trading Limited – £220 ex vat– Warden Services (for July/Aug)

MWAgri – £692 ex vat (for July/Aug)

Petty Cash payment to Clerk for July £42 ex vat Phone rent and calls

David Brattle. Materials for repairs to picnic bench £93.00

Return to VHMC of half of £10,000 grant monies previously given to PC by VHMC for the electrical work at the Village hall, now to be carried out by the VHMC

b. Cheques/payments received

LGVH Management Committee - Village Hall Manager salary

PLANNING SCHEDULE - CURRENT APPLICATIONS (status at 3rd August, 2020)

(Red text show changes since previous meeting)

Mosshall Farm, Nettleden Road North. Construction of stables for personal use. 20/00453/FUL. Objection by LGPC as follows:- Little Gaddesden Parish Council (LGPC) objects to the application, but is prepared to withdraw the objection if the applicant will confirm that the track shown on the location map is not part of the development for which permission is sought. Further LGPC asks that ‘Permitted Development Rights’ be withdrawn on this property owing to the development that has taken place there from the original 4/02699/15/ful and following 4/00614/17/roc applications.

We would also like to draw your attention to the high bank (approx. 2 metres) that has appeared for the entire length on the inside of the roadside hedge of the property since work started in 2017 – is this perhaps a matter for Enforcement? LGPC would request that as soon as is possible under the current circumstances, a site visit takes place to resolve these matters.

Awaiting DBC decision

Birchwood, Golf Club Road. Demolition of existing single storey extension and timber balcony to facilitate the construction of a replacement 2-storey extension and re-cladding of the external walls. Replacement of all windows and doors, construction of new rooflight, alterations to the existing driveway and new vehicular access. 20/00796/FHA

Supported by LGPC, **Awaiting DBC decision**

Signed by the Chairman..... Dated.....

2 Little Gaddesden House, Nettleden Road. Replacement of existing windows at front and rear of property. 20/01012/LBC & 20/01011/FHA Supported by LGPC, **Granted by DBC**

60 Nettleden Road North. Construction of a Bin Store / Garden Store with timber cladding and mono pitched roof with roof tiles to match existing house. 20/01067/FHA Supported by LGPC, **Granted by DBC**

49 Little Gaddesden. Replacement of metal windows to the 1930 front extension of cottage with wooden framed windows. 20/01066/LBC Supported by LGPC, **Granted by DBC**

Hudnall House, Hudnall Lane. Demolition of Shed/Store buildings and construction of new link between house and garage. 20/01113/FHA Supported by LGPC, **Granted by DBC**

1 The Red House Nettleden Road North. Replacement of 3 existing windows to the Nettleden Road elevation at 1st floor level with new hardwood timber windows. The new windows will identically match the existing windows. Existing window furniture will be re-used where possible. 20/00997/LBC Supported by LGPC, **Granted by DBC**

5, Little Gaddesden House. Proposal: Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) attached to planning permission 4/01810/19/FHA - Rear single storey extension. 20/01134/ROC Supported by LGPC, **Granted by DBC**

45 Nettleden Road. Little Gaddesden. Installation of rooflights & a roof lantern. Installation of new electric gates & fence to the front boundary and the removal of chimney stack. 20/01251/FHA

The Parish Council consultation response reads:-

The Parish Council has not received enough information on 45 Little Gaddesden to make a decision. However, to be helpful we would like to state the following:-

Roof Lights - In principle, Parish Council does not object to the five new conservation roof lights facing into the garden of No.45 it does however object to the two roof lights on the side of the neighbouring property at No. 44

Extractor Fan - As shown on Plan 3029/3/ID Revised May, venting of the wet room and lavatory extractor fan into the neighbouring property is not acceptable and should be arranged to vent into the garden of No.45 on a wall not facing No.44 using a wall vent, or vent into the roof using a vent tile (not using a pipe through the roof.)".

Roof Lantern - In principle, the Parish Council does not object to the roof lantern proposed.

Chimney - In principle, the Parish Council does not object to the removal of the small chimney at the rear of the property, as this is not visible from the highway and is difficult to see from other angles. However, we do consider Chimneys to be a major characteristic of the houses within the Conservation Area.

Fence and Gate - In principle, the Parish Council objects to the proposed closed panel fence and gate from the information provided, for the following reasons. The proposed fence at 1.6m is too high and the height of the gate is not specified (we have to assume 1.6m). The current gate has a height of 1.05m, curved upward at the edges to 1.2m. As viewed from the road: The houses to the right (46, 47 &48) have a frontage to The Green of a picket fence of average height of 1.1 metres; The houses to the left (44 &43) have a frontage of a brick wall (0.9 metres) backed with a tall hedge. There are nine driveway accesses across The Green. Five of these accesses are open (i.e. no gates), three have five-bar gates and then there is 45 Little Gaddesden. Now considering the broader context, the village has a very open visual aspect with clusters of properties separated by open fields, woodland and paddocks. Looking at property entrances; Along the route of the Nettleden road from Ringshall, past Ashridge Cottages, to the end of the village there are

Signed by the Chairman..... Dated.....

approximately 80 entrance driveways to properties. Of these, 40 are open access with no gates, 28 have five bar wooden gates, 7 are field access gates and 4 are metal. There is one example of a solid wooden gate. The Parish Council's policy aligns with the Chiltern Design Guide, that within the Conservation Areas the entrances and boundaries should be simple and permeable; Preferably with an open entrance or a 5 bar wooden gates, with a hedgerow boundary. Brick pillars and solid gates are not characteristic, give a suburban feel and should be avoided.

Summary. To give a considered opinion the Parish Council would like to see design details of the fence and gate and drawing of the street scene with dimensions. **Awaiting DBC decision**

32 Ringshall Road Ringshall. Alterations to breakfast room roof, construction of orangery to rear and green house in rear garden. 20/01391/FHA

LGPC Comment below

Members of the planning team made a socially distanced site visit. We concluded that there was little scope for material planning objection to the application since the advent of 4 metre single storey permissive development came into being. We do wish to register this comment. We feel that the proposed orangery is overly large in scale for the character and appearance of the Ringshall Conservation Area. Whilst almost all of the cottages in this row have rear extensions and conservatories of some sort, they are all smaller than 4 metres in extent. Although the cottages at the upper end of this row are not listed (3 to 13 Ringshall Cottages are) they are of considerable age c.1860's and amenity value and when the Conservation Area Character Appraisal (CACA) for the Ringshall conservation area is assembled we will apply for Local Listing on all the cottages. LGPC and James Moir DBC are currently nearing completion on the Little Gaddesden Appraisal.

DBC decision awaited

Windyridge, Hudnall Lane. A double garage and single storey extension. 20/01407/FHA

Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

Torwood, Consultation request on front gates from owners of the property prior to application. Parish Council response:-

Thank you for taking the trouble to send pictures of gates that would be acceptable to yourselves whilst meeting the Chiltern Design Guide. All of the gates pictured would indeed be acceptable to the Parish Council. Aesthetically the unpainted wood, with the less solid/more permeable design would be preferable and wooden gate posts rather than the brick ones you have currently would be ideal. Thank you for the care and consideration you have given this issue. LGPC are wishing to maintain the rural ambiance of the village.

Applications received since the last meeting.

After the public had had an opportunity to comment on the applications below, the Planning Working Group made their recommendations to the full Parish Council.

Small Meadow, Beacon Road, Ringshall. Works to trees. 20/01497/TCA

Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

10 Ringshall Road Ringshall. Construction of Wooden Summer House in Rear Garden.

20/01404/FHA **Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited**

The Bungalow Home Farm Works Nettleden Road. Use of The Bungalow as a single dwelling house (class C3). 20/01591/LDE **Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited**

Signed by the Chairman..... Dated.....

The Extension Home Farm Works Nettleden Road. Use of The Extension as a single dwelling house (class C3). 20/01592/LDE Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

5 Little Gaddesden House. Rear Single Storey Extension. 20/01628/LBC. Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

National Trust Land opposite the Green, Little Gaddesden. Works to trees. 20/01848/TCA Assuming the application related to Ash dieback (this was subsequently confirmed), Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

Plot 17. Field Opposite Church in Church Road Replace existing damaged fencing/hedge with new wood/barbed wire fence. Relocate existing access gate to the field. Alter starting point of public right of way. 20/01927/FUL See also Public Participation section for discussion on this application. See submitted response below.

Following the Parish Council meeting of the 3rd August 2020, Little Gaddesden Parish Council would like to make the following response:

There are a number of inaccuracies in the application, as follows:

- a) The footpath is drawn in the wrong place, as the path should line up directly with the entrance gates to the Church.
- b) There are no hedges on the perimeter of the land.
- c) The Land Registry shows that legal title to the land is vested in the Mead Trust and not Goldsmith Land as stated. This needs to be clarified.
- d) The address given for Goldsmith Land is not the registered address. This needs to be clarified.

Our understanding of the application is as follows:-

Asked for:

1. Replacement of existing fence.
2. Extension of existing fence - 53m section.
3. Extension of existing fence - 24m section on the southern boundary.
4. Extension of existing fence - 50m section on the western side between 53m & 24m.
5. Removal of existing access gates between plot 17 and plot 16 (plot 16 is the assumed name of adjacent plot away from the Church).
6. Movement of public footpath away from historic starting point at the Church gates, thereby replacing public access gates with fence. This gate has no vehicular access to the field.
7. Building new public pedestrian access gate at new location indicated. This gate is for pedestrian access for the proposed moved footpath. [This does not appear to be mentioned in the application or the plan but it must be implied because the proposed vehicular gate would not be a suitable footpath gate]
8. Building of vehicular access gate for access to the field directly on to the highway.

LGPC response

Signed by the Chairman..... Dated.....

1. LGPC does not object to the repair of the existing fence in the same style as the existing fence. However, we would note that the existing fence is a mixture of post/wire and fence/rail. LGPC objects to the replacement of the fence/rail fencing with the inferior post/barbed wired fencing and for consistency all replacement fencing should be post and rail. This is to maintain the character of the setting adjacent to the curtilage of the Grade 1 listed Church. This applies to all fencing listed below.
2. LGPC objects to the extensions of the existing fencing (53m). LGPC wishes to maintain the openness of the fields as outlined in the Article 4 Direction on the land. Part of this line may have been previously fenced, but this was removed many years ago for open access for grazing sheep on this and neighbouring land.
3. LGPC objects to this section of fencing (24m on the southern boundary) as it is a new piece of fence across open fields, contrary to the Article 4 on the land. The Article 4 was put in place to protect the Conservation Area and the AONB from unwanted visual and physical barriers on the otherwise open aspect of this historic grazing land.
4. LGPC objects to this extension of the existing fencing (50m section between 53m & 24m) as it is a new piece of fencing across open fields. The fences applied for in 3 and 4 would enclose historically open land, contrary to the Article 4 on the land. The Article 4 was put in place to protect the Conservation Area and the AONB from unwanted visual and physical barriers on the otherwise open aspect of this historic grazing land.
5. LGPC objects to the removal of the internal access gate (“Existing gate”) between plot 17 and 16 as it provided the only access point from plot 17 to the highway via plot 16. The access point of plot 16 is adjacent to plot 17. LGPC views this proposed gate removal as deliberate deprivation of existing access to the highway. We can only speculate that this is to increase the likelihood of obtaining a separate highway access onto plot 17. We also note that both plots 16 and 17 are or have recently been owned by the same company, so an easement provision should have been simple. No justification has been put forward.
6. LGPC objects to the movement of the existing public footpath (incorrectly drawn) from the entrance gates of the Church to the location indicated. This is an historic (greater than 200 years) route to the Church from the village of Little Gaddesden. Any movement of the footpath would be a destruction of a significant part of the village’s history. The existing line of the footpath provides an important viewing line to the impressive side of the Grade I listed Church as one approaches it. The movement of a footpath is not, in any event, a matter to be dealt with in a planning application. No justification, such as ‘proposed development’ has been given for its relocation.
7. LGPC objects to the implied building of a new public pedestrian access gate in the location indicated (required for the proposed move of the public footpath), for the reasons above in answer 6.

Signed by the Chairman..... Dated.....

- 8. LGPC objects to the application for vehicular access to the highway as there is an historic and suitable access to the highway a few metres away via plot 16 (discussed in point 5). Suitable easements could simply be put in place between the landowners of plot 16 and 17. In addition, we believe that this is a dangerous place for a vehicular access, as it is the primary access point to the Church. i.e. peak pedestrian access to the Church, a tight turning circle and an informal disabled parking point directly outside the Church. We also believe that the proposed access gate at the point indicated contravenes highways safety design criteria, as the road by the proposed gate is close to the sharp bend to the east of the Church and the road also becomes a private road before the sharp bend.

The Spinney, Nettleden Road North, Demolition of Existing Detached Garage /Flat and Construction of Detached Oak Framed Garage with Home Office/Storage Area Above.
20/02030/FHA Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

Denison House, Nettleden Road North. Construction of a small greenhouse. 20/02084/FHA
Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

Bailiffs, Nettleden Road. Detached Granny Annexe to Replace Detached Garage. 20/02131/FHA
Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

Plot 17, Field Opposite Church, Land South East of Church Road. Works to tree.20/02132/TPO
Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

9 Nettleden Road North. Two storey rear extension. 20/02100/FHA
Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

Torwood Nettleden Road. Proposed entrance gates and associated fencing. 20/02145/FHA
Supported by LGPC, DBC decision awaited

Information to share / Items for the next meeting

Terry Douris advised that the HCC Speed Management Strategy was out for consultation and asked the Parish Council to review it and respond accordingly.

Terry Douris advised that HCC Engineers had identified the damaged area of piping that was limiting the drainage capacity at Beacon Road, Ringshall and were moving forward to the next stage of the project.

Kathryn Magson asked that action be taken on the recording of documents held as discussed at the last meeting. The Clerk said he would continue to prepare the list of archived documents held at Ashridge and elsewhere with the intention of approaching contractors re electronic saving of the data.

The meeting closed at **10.15pm.** The next meeting is on **Monday 21st September, 2020.**

Signed by the Chairman..... Dated.....