



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held on Tuesday 30th April 2019 at the Council Hall, Charter Court, Vicarage Lane, Kings Langley.

Present: Cllrs Anderson, Angiolini (Chair), Button, De Silva (Vice-Chair) and Johnson.

Also Present: Mr Paul Dunham, Clerk to the Council.

1. Apologies for Absence.

1.1 Cllr McLean.

2. Declarations of Interest.

2.1 None.

3. Public Participation / Question Time.

3.1 There were no members of the public present who wished to speak at this stage.

4. Other Matters.

4.1 As there was a member of the public present who had an interest in the following item, with the Members' permission, its consideration was brought forward.

4.1.1 Three Rivers District Council.

Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Application: Outline Application: Construction of new Motorway Service Area (MSA)

Address: Land South West Of Junction 20 Of M25 And West Of A41 Watford Road Hunton Bridge

Application No: 19/0646/OUT

4.1.2 Members agreed to submit an OBJECTION to this application, as follows:

'Kings Langley Parish Council objects strongly to this planning application on the following grounds.

1. It would make the existing traffic congestion problems at junction 20 significantly worse, and be in breach of Government policy as per the Department for Transport's Circular 02/2013:

"On-line (between junctions) service areas are considered to be more accessible to road users and as a result are more attractive and conducive to encouraging drivers to stop and take a break. They also avoid the creation of any increase in traffic demand at existing junctions."



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

The traffic mitigation measures proposed would be:

- i) unachievable / ineffective (there isn't enough physical room to make the M25 offslip additional lanes wide or long enough to make any material difference)
- ii) counter-productive (the additional lanes on the roundabout would cause even more lane discipline confusion)
- iii) less safe (traffic entering the junction from the A4251 would have to contend with three lanes instead of two coming at potentially high speed from the A41 southbound out of sight on the right)
- iv) more restrictive (traffic entering the junction from the A4251 would be less able to access the junction/queue all the way back through Kings Langley, as happened when it was previously traffic light controlled).

So, these measures, and the additional traffic, would make the existing, chronic traffic congestion problem much, much worse.

2. It would damage the Green Belt, as the main building would stand out in a highly visible location on the top side of the Gade valley.

This is not a special circumstance where national or local economic interests would outweigh green belt planning controls, because there is an alternative which is located nearby.

Each application has to be considered on its own merits, but comparing effects on the Green Belt is material, and this proposal would cause far more harm to the Green Belt than the alternative.

3. Increased and unacceptable noise, air and light pollution

Given the increase in heavy goods traffic, an increase in noise pollution is inevitable.

Every vehicle coming off the motorway would travel 2 miles from junction 20 to the parking area and back, causing increases in air pollution including increases in hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxide and carbon dioxide) having detrimental impact on the health for all, especially children attending the nearby primary school, church-goers, nearby residents and wildlife.

Whilst there is already light pollution the M25, Junction 20, and the A41, this proposed development would extend it further into the countryside.

4. It would be wholly unnecessary considering the alternative proposal for an on-line motorway service area on the M25 between junctions 16 & 17, where the national and local interests could be achieved without either of these two planning problems.

Kings Langley and the Gade valley would be harmed and not obtain any benefit from the junction 20 proposal (especially the claimed local interests), so the council asks Three Rivers District Council to refuse planning permission.'



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

5. Consideration of Planning Applications.

Reference No: 4/00875/19/LDP (INFORMATION ONLY)
House & Road: 50, Vicarage Lane
Proposal: Single Storey Rear Extension
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application

Reference No: 4/00876/19/FHA
House & Road: 28, Rectory Lane
Proposal: Single Storey Front and Side Extension
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application

Reference No: 4/00923/19/FHA
House & Road: 11, Rockcliffe Avenue
Proposal: Two Storey Rear Extension
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application

Reference No: 4/00851/19/ROC
House & Road: Apsley Two, Brindley Way, Doolittle Meadows, Hemel Hempstead
Proposal: Removal of Condition 1 (Class B1 Usage) Attached to pp 4/1329/87 (Retention of Phase I and II Buildings Without Compliance with Condition 4 of pp 4/0985/85)
Submission: The Council OBJECTED to this application because it believes the premises should be retained for business purposes to support local employment.

Reference No: 4/00922/19/FHA
House & Road: Robinson Noakes, 31, Hempstead Road
Proposal: Part Single / Part Two Storey Side and Rear Extension & Single Storey Front Extension
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application

Reference No: 4/00978/19/FHA
House & Road: 39, Vicarage Lane
Proposal: Single Storey First Floor Rear Extension & First Floor Rear Extension
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application

Reference No: 4/00977/19/FHA
House & Road: 55, Coniston Road
Proposal: Demolition of Existing Single Storey Rear Extension. Construction of Single Storey Rear Extension
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

6. Any Other Business (not requiring formal decision).
- 6.1 Cllr Button reported that the former youth club / Montessori School building had been boarded up. The Clerk responded that he had contacted County Councillor Robert (as it is an Hertfordshire County Council building) to ask if he would make enquiries.
- 6.2 Cllr Johnson reported that former Cllr Peter McDonnell had contacted the Dacorum Borough Council's Leader, Andrew Williams regarding his proposals for tree planting in the Parish.
- 6.3 Cllr Button raised the issue of the continued fly-tipping by the Canal and River Trust's (CRT) skip in Home Park Link Road. Cllr Anderson and the Clerk provided some background regarding ownership and previous actions. It was noted that the land was owned by Imagination Technology, although Hertfordshire County Council has "adopted" it. The CRT's response when complaints about the fly-tips are received is that they "will have to contact the landowner. Cllr Button undertook to contact Imagination to try to resolve the issue and, hopefully, arrive at a solution to prevent further tipping.

Meeting Closed at 7:56pm