

<b>Committee date</b>	Wednesday, 8 January 2020
<b>Application reference</b>	19/00835/FULM
<b>Site address</b>	Former Lloyds Bank, 99 St Albans Road, Watford
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition: Complete removal of the existing building and associated boundary walls to the north and south. Change of use: To develop a mixed use scheme, maintaining an A2 use and adding A3 and C3. Proposed coffee house, estate agent to the ground floor. The remaining floors will house 21 flats - 10 x 1 bed 2 person and 11 x 2 bed 4 person.
<b>Applicant</b>	Fairfield Estate Agents
<b>Agent</b>	Sixfootstudio LLP
<b>Type of Application</b>	Major Full Planning Permission
<b>Reason for committee Item</b>	Major Application
<b>Target decision date (Agreed Extension)</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> January 2020
<b>Statutory publicity</b>	Press Advert and Site Notice published 26 <sup>th</sup> July 2019. Neighbouring properties consulted 18 <sup>th</sup> July 2019
<b>Case officer</b>	Obafemi Okusipe, <a href="mailto:obafemi.okusipe@watford.gov.uk">obafemi.okusipe@watford.gov.uk</a>
<b>Ward</b>	Nascot

## 1. Recommendation

That planning permission be refused as set out in Section 8 of this report.

## 2. Site and surroundings

2.1 The proposal relates to a building which comprises a former bank with car parking area to the rear. This art-deco style building with Neo-Georgian influence was built in 1928. The building is located in a prominent position at the junction of Langley Road and St. Albans Road. The building is locally listed with interesting detailing and a unique appearance and makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. The particular feature of the building includes:

- the banking hall to the front which is a double height single storey building of multi-coloured brick, with a two storey rear extension. The entrance has broad moulded stonework around double wooden doors, with stone steps and top light.
- there is stone banding across the building's main elevations. Three large timber sliding sash windows are located on each of the street elevations. These are topped by gauged brick jack arches, with the central keystones painted white, and have stone sills. The roof is hipped and of tiles. It is

located behind a brick parapet, with a flat roof to the rear.

- 2.2 Despite its age and degree of neglect the building retains its original appearance albeit - its architectural composition has somewhat been compromised by modern fascia signs on both elevations. The building was last used as a bank for which it was built. The upper floor provided ancillary offices or residential accommodation for the banking staff. However, the bank has been vacant for some time and now suffers a degree of disrepair.
- 2.3 The car park to the rear of the bank is accessed via Langley Road. Immediately to the west of the site, adjacent to the car park, there is a single storey electric sub-station structure. Beyond this electric substation there is a terrace of 2 storey Victorian buildings where the ground floors are used for commercial purposes the upper floors are in residential use. To the south of the building, there is a service road which provides access to the rear of the shops fronting onto Langley Road.
- 2.4 The building is within Nascot Conservation Area, and within the designated Local Shopping Frontage under the Watford Local Plan Proposals Map. This is a sustainable location where there is good access to bus routes and a range of facilities offered by the shopping centre. The building is also within 200m of Watford Junction Station which provides rail services to London Euston. The character of the conservation area is chiefly drawn from its variety of historic residential or commercial buildings. The area within the vicinity of the site is fairly mixed. The frontage onto St Albans Road is of a commercial character, where buildings front straight onto the pavement. Buildings predominantly date from the mid to late nineteenth century and are a mixture of two and three storeys high. However, the area to the west of the site gradually turns into a residential area. The buildings to the south of the site are not within the conservation area, are low key and mediocre in appearance.
- 2.5 The application site benefits from an existing planning consent (17/01104/FULM) for the redevelopment of the former Lloyds Bank site, with the retention of the front façade of the bank building to provide a mixed use scheme four storey extension on the roof for 14 residential units 12 x 1-bedroom flats and two 2-bedroom flats on the first to fourth floor (Class C3) and retail units (Class A1 and/or A2 and/or A3 uses,) on the ground floor, with associated cycle parking, car parking, and public realm improvements.
- 2.6 The existing building is a locally listed building and located in a designated conservation area. Further information is available in the appendices to the report and on the council's website.

### **3 Summary of the proposal**

#### **3.1 Proposal**

3.2 The proposal involves the redevelopment of the entire site, which involves total demolition of the existing locally listed building and the construction of a new 8 storey building providing 21 residential (10no. 1 bed/2person and 11no. 2 bed/4person) flats on upper floors and Class A1 and A2 uses (a coffee shop – 69.95m<sup>2</sup> and estate agents – 70.4m<sup>2</sup>) at ground floor. The proposal would also incorporate a residential lobby – 70.35m<sup>2</sup>, amenity space, residential and café refuse storage, cycle storage, plant and planting bed at ground floor level. The proposal will provide 1no. disabled parking space and access to the refuse storage space will be from the service road to the side of the building. The application has been supported a Heritage Statement and Design and Access Statement.

3.3 The applicant has undertaken pre-application through MARF and informal discussions since the 2017 (17/01104/FULM) application was refused. The scheme has been influenced by comments on the previous application that was allowed on appeal.

#### **3.4 Conclusion**

3.5 The redevelopment of the entire site to provide 21 new dwellings on this site, providing a net increase of 21 residential flats dwellings, accords with Policies HS1 and HS2 and while the provision of Class A1 and A2 uses are acceptable in principle. The design of the proposed flats is also considered acceptable within a residential area and the siting of the building will ensure that they will have no significant adverse impacts on surrounding residential properties. The proposed development would provide good quality accommodation and a high level of amenity for future occupiers.

3.6 The proposed development would not provide any affordable housing which is not in line with Policy HS3 of Watford's Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31. However, the economic viability assessor appointed by the council has advised that it would not be viable for on-site affordable housing or a commuted sums contribution to be made in this case. Notwithstanding this, paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Guidance requires at least 10% of shared ownership units for any major planning application for new residential dwellings. There are exemptions to this requirement but the development proposal does not meet any of these.

3.7 The proposed development would result in the total loss of the locally listed building and would harm the Nascot Conservation Area. Consequently, the proposed development would detrimentally impact on the heritage asset with the harm outweighing any benefits. In addition, the proposed development fails to enhance the character and appearance of a locally listed building, the setting of a conservation area, the character and appearance of a heritage asset and the conservation area. The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy UD2 of the Watford's Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31 and due to the loss of the locally listed building and not preserving or enhancing the conservation area. Taking the above into account, there are considered to be adverse effects that outweigh the public benefits of the proposal and therefore it is recommended that the application should be refused. [paragraphs](#)

#### **4. Relevant policies**

Members should refer to the background papers attached to the agenda. These highlight the policy framework under which this application is determined. Specific policy considerations with regard to this particular application are detailed in section 6 below.

#### **5. Relevant site history/background information**

5.1 Planning application 17/01104/FULM for The redevelopment of the former Lloyds Bank site, with the retention of the front façade of the bank building to provide a mixed use scheme four storey extension on the roof for 14 residential units 12 x 1-bedroom flats and two 2-bedroom flats on the first to fourth floor (Class C3) and retail units (Class A1 and/or A2 and/or A3 uses,) on the ground floor, with associated cycle parking, car parking, and public realm improvements was refused on 17.5.18 and allowed on appeal.

#### **6. Main considerations**

6.1 The main issues to be considered in the determination of these applications are:

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Housing
- c) Impact on heritage and character and appearance of the area
- d) Quality of the new building provided
- e) Impact upon the amenities of the adjoining residential properties
- f) Transportation, access and parking
- g) Other Matters

## 6.2 (a) Principle of development

- 6.2.1 The site is within the Nascot Conservation Area and the site has a locally listed building located on it, both of which must be taken into consideration in any redevelopment of the site.
- 6.2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that “plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development” by granting planning permission unless:
1. The application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
  2. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.
- 6.2.3 The presumption in favour of sustainable development is supported by Watford Borough Council's Core Strategy Policy WBC 1 in a local policy context. It emphasises that the council will take a positive approach to considering development proposals which reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development in line with relevant policies and paragraphs within the NPPF. Subject to these relevant paragraphs, the principle of redevelopment on the site is considered acceptable.

## 6.3 (b) Housing

- 6.3.1 Policy HS2 gives guidance on housing mix and states the council will seek a mix of housing types based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The proposal provides no.10 x 1 bed 2 person and no. 11 x 2 bed 4 person, which does not meet this policy but due to the lack of a 5 year housing supply could not be justified to refuse the application.
- 6.3.2 The proposal does not provide 35% affordable housing in accordance with Policy HS3 and therefore a viability assessment has been submitted as part of the application. The viability has been reviewed by an independent viability consultant (Aspinall Verdi) and their report is available to view on council's website.
- 6.3.3 Aspinall Verdi stated in their financial viability assessment that based on the assessment, the scheme cannot afford to deliver any affordable housing

required by planning policy. However, the financial viability assessment recommended a review mechanism upon completion of the project based on current Bench Land Value and profit. The details of the Bench Land Value applied, the profit and other cost variables are stated in Aspinall Verdi's financial viability assessment and the s106 agreement. Notwithstanding this, as previously highlighted, the NPPF requires 10% of new housing for major schemes to be provided as shared ownership. This means that as a minimum (2.1 rounded up to 3) 3 of the units should be shared ownership. This has not been offered as part of the proposal, contrary to paragraph 64.

6.3.4 Notwithstanding the viability assessment, a review mechanism in a s106 and compliance with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework has not been agreed.

6.4 (c) Impact on heritage and character and appearance of the area

The proposed site is located within Nascot Conservation Area and the application building is on the council's list of architecturally significant buildings. Hence, any development on the site should respond to the historic and architectural significant of the area and the locally listed building.

6.4.1 The application site is within a mixed-use area of generally commercial on St Albans Road and residential along Langley Road. The existing building is sited between 2 storey buildings on St Albans Road to the south and Langley Road to the west. This area developed during the Victorian era and is characterised by domestic scale residential properties of 2 and 3 storeys typical of their era in respect of design and materials. They are of a traditional design incorporating many features seen in the locality, including sash style windows, stone sills, lintels and mullions, and parapet walls at roof level. The proposed development is an 8 storey building with roof gardens.

6.4.2 The application property is a single storey brick building with two storey extension with hipped roof made of tiles and the extension is flat. The application property is of multi-coloured brick with a two storey extension. The entrance has broad moulded stonework around double wooden doors with stone steps and top light. Three large 9 over 9 wooden sliding sash window to each street elevation, topped by gauge brick jack arches, with the central keystones painted white, stone sills. The roof is hipped and of tiles, behind brick parapet with flat roof to rear. Overall, the design of the proposed development is acceptable and appropriate for the application site. However, the proposed materials do not reflect those found in the surrounding area and include yellow stock facing brick, fibre cement slate tiles, cast stone lintels and sills and white uPVC windows.

- 6.4.3 The Nascot Conservation Area largely retains its Victorian character and through its surviving urban form and architectural detail. The key difference between this area and many other areas of Watford that date from the nineteenth century relates to the notable variety of architectural styles displayed and the diversity of the detailing evident on the buildings.
- 6.4.4 The significance of the conservation area also lies in part with the fact that most of it was constructed during a relatively short time span so that there is a coherence to the historic and aesthetic value and to the structure of the urban area; such as the role of St Albans Road as a commercial street and the presence of local land mark buildings at key locations.
- 6.4.5 In conservation areas, the demolition of the buildings generally requires consent. In assessing whether a building should be demolished or retained, the historical and architectural merit of the building, referred as “asset’s value” should be sufficiently appraised.
- 6.4.6 In this case the building emerged after the Victorian Era, a period where banks were the sign of economic prosperity and the bank buildings were accordingly constructed to generally impress the wealth associated the financial establishments.
- 6.4.7 Given the location, the architecture of the building responded to the corner location using a style which sought to draw attention by providing a building incorporating a double height ground floor, oversized entrance and windows with detailing to draw the eyes attention to this key location. The particular values of the historic asset are considered to be as follows:
- a. its architectural form as a good local example of a bank building from this period – a unique Art-Deco, with element of Neo Georgian design which has remained relatively unaltered externally and does have internal details in places with particular reference to the internal banking hall;
  - b. its prominent position with the architecture responding to that location seeking to create a land mark building with significant street scene value;
  - c. its local community value as a recognisable building performing a social and commercial function in the local area and its use as a key reference point for the local community; and
  - d. the rarity of the style and type of the building in the locality.
- 6.4.8 The two heritage assets for consideration in this instance as:

- 99 St Albans Road (Former Lloyds Bank – a Locally Listed building, Local List Number 167) and
- The Nascot Conservation Area.

- 6.4.9 The existing building is a non-designated heritage asset as defined in the NPPF. The reasons for the building's nomination on the local list are for its architectural interest and landmark and streetscape quality. The existing building has retained its significance and its internal decorative fixtures are still present, although it is currently vacant. The proposed development would result in the complete loss of this heritage asset which can only be considered harmful.
- 6.4.10 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF requires the significance of a non-designated heritage asset to be taken into account in determining the application and a balanced judgement to be made on the scale of harm or loss. The proposed development would result in the total loss of the non-designated heritage asset and therefore will result in considerable harm.
- 6.4.11 The former Lloyds Bank is noted as a building which makes a positive contribution to the Nascot Conservation Area, which underlines its significance, therefore its loss would cause considerable harm to the designated heritage asset.
- 6.4.12 It is considered that the demolition of the existing building would cause less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. This harm should be considered in the context of para. 196 of the NPPF which states: 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'
- 6.4.13 The balance of the harm to its significance as referred in para. 196 of the NPPF, is considered in terms of the impact of the proposal on the significance of a designated asset in highlighted in para. 193. Para. 193 of the NPPF states that 'when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'
- 6.4.14 The applicant submitted a Heritage Statement and was asked for a supplementary statement to support the proposal. These were duly

considered by independent heritage consultant (Place Service) and were considered inadequate. It is considered that the statement failed to adequately consider the significance of the Nascot Conservation Area and the non-designated heritage asset (locally listed building). However, with regard to the impact of the proposal, the applicant's Heritage Statement focussed more on viability than the impact upon the significance of the heritage asset affected as required. As such, it is considered that no meaningful conclusions can be drawn from this report with regards to the impact upon the significance of these heritage assets.

6.4.15 The proposed development by virtue of its scale, massing, design features and proposed materials as presented in the Design and Access Statement did not consider the significance of the heritage asset by the total loss of its architectural interest, its significance and its internal decorative fixtures, landmark and streetscape quality. The loss of significance of the heritage asset is further exacerbated by the loss of its positive contribution to the conservation area, its connectivity to its setting and the loss of the asset value of the locally listed building. These further contribute to the adverse impact on the heritage, significance and setting of a designated conservation area (Nascot Conservation Area) resulting in less than substantial harm to the heritage asset and the designated conservation area.

6.4.16 The proposed development by virtue of its mixed land use nature would provide public benefits as stated by the applicant. These benefits would include job creation, financial contributions (CIL and Council Tax), housing provision but no affordable housing would be provided. However, it is considered that these public benefits are not enough to outweigh the harm to or loss of a heritage asset and designated heritage area. This position has been collaborated by Place Services (independent Heritage Consultant) in their report. Therefore, this application has failed to demonstrate how the public benefits from this project outweigh the harm to or loss of the heritage asset and a designated heritage area.

6.4.17 Notwithstanding the loss of the heritage asset and the harm this causes to the Conservation Area, the proposed 8 storey modern building is considered to detract from the character and appearance of Nascot Conservation Area. The proposed building, which is located at a gateway to Nascot Conservation Area, does not respond to this sensitive context with regard to its height, mass and form. Any new building in this location needs to respond to its context.

6.4.18 Having considered that the proposed development approach (redevelopment) resulting in the loss of heritage asset, its impacts on its

significance and Nascot Conservation Area, the cumulative impact within a wider context and the inability to provide enough evidence to demonstrate how the public benefits of this proposed development outweigh the harm it would introduce to the heritage asset and Nascot Conservation Area, it is considered that the proposed development's public benefits do not outweigh harm to or loss of heritage asset and Nascot Conservation Area. In addition, the proposal is not considered to enhance the character and appearance of the heritage asset and Nascot Conservation Area. These have been given substantial weight in this assessment.

## 6.5 (d) Quality of the new building provided

6.5.1 The Residential Design Guide (RDG) sets out various standards and guidelines to ensure that new residential development provides high quality accommodation with good levels of amenity for future occupiers. The proposed development's residential flat sizes would range from 54.3m<sup>2</sup> to 72.6m<sup>2</sup> total floor area which meet the minimum floor areas set out in the nationally described housing standards of 50m<sup>2</sup> to 70m<sup>2</sup> for 1 bed 2person bedroom and 2 bed 4persons bedroom flats respectively. Each single and double bedroom would achieve the minimum bedroom floor area of 7.5m<sup>2</sup> and 11.5m<sup>2</sup> respectively. The proposed flats would receive sufficient daylight and sunlight. Overall, it is considered all of the dwellings would provide good quality accommodation in respect of outlook, privacy and natural light.

6.5.2 The proposed roof garden areas for the flats would be around 200.6m<sup>2</sup> and would not meet the minimum area of 335m<sup>2</sup> (50m<sup>2</sup> + no. 19 x 15m<sup>2</sup>) for 21 flats as set out in the Residential Design Guide, 2016. However, this is considered acceptable because of the proposal's location in this part of the town centre, where the future residents will benefit from the range of services within their reach and this shortfall would not result in substantial harm to the amenities of future occupiers. In addition, the provision of 21 residential flats will on balance will be more beneficial to meet housing needs in the community than a shortfall in amenity space. Overall, considering the location and layout of the site, the orientation of the dwellings, the level of amenity for future occupiers and the size of the roof garden areas, the building would provide satisfactory high quality space and accommodation for future occupiers.

## 6.6 (e) Impact upon the amenities of the adjoining residential properties

6.6.1 The application site is not directly adjoining any residential building. There is about 13.0m separation distance to a windowed elevation of the nearest residential building at No. 101 St Albans Road and No. 2 Langley Road. The proposed development abuts an electricity sub-station to the rear and there

is no side window along the flank wall of No. 3 Langley Road, which adjoins the sub-station. The separation distance would not cause a significant loss of light or outlook to the principal rear habitable windows or garden of the neighbouring property and would not result in additional noise to the detriment of neighbouring occupiers' living conditions.

6.6.2 The privacy arc of rear habitable windows of neighbouring properties would not be infringed upon due to the siting of these neighbouring properties in relation to the layout of the proposed development. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would have substantial adverse impact on neighbouring properties of the application site to justify a refusal.

#### 6.7 (f) Transportation, access and parking

6.7.1 The application site is in a highly sustainable location, within a short walk of Watford Junction Station and bus interchange about 200m to the west, the town centre and bus stops. This gives access to a wide range of rail and bus services. Further bus services are accessible on St. Albans Road, and within the town centre, together with a full range of town centre shops, services and facilities. In light of this high level of accessibility a reduced level of onsite car parking provision is proposed. The site is located within Controlled Parking Zone.

6.7.2 Vehicular access is provided through the alley way abutting St Albans Road. The alley way would provide access to the disable car parking space, refuse and bin store and cycle storage. The proposed residential flats have no car parking spaces. However, the proposed development includes a provision of 1 disabled parking space. Given the highly accessible location of the site, located within a controlled parking zone, this accords with saved Policy T26 of the Watford District Plan 2000 for car-free developments, subject to the future occupiers of the proposed development being totally excluded from permit and voucher entitlement of the local controlled parking zone. This is necessary in order to ensure that future residents will not be entitled to parking permits or vouchers, thereby preventing any additional on-street parking on the surrounding roads. This is consistent with saved Policy T26 of the Watford District Plan 2000.

6.7.3 The proposal will also incorporate safe and secure cycle storage space within the building which accords with the sustainable transport objectives in saved Policy T10 of the Watford District Plan 2000. The bin storage bins will also be located within the building on the ground floor with vehicular access from the service road for collection. The Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to

conditions.

## 6.8 Other Matters

- 6.8.1 The proposed drainage strategy is based upon permeable paving and underground attenuation tank storage and discharge into Thames Water surface water sewer. The drainage strategy has been approved by the County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. A condition requiring the submission of a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site based on the approved drainage strategy and sustainable drainage principles should be attached to any grant of planning permission.
- 6.8.2 The applicant has highlighted that there is an existing planning consent (17/01104/FULM) allowed on appeal which proposes to retain part of the heritage asset. Informal discussions with planners and the Major Applications Review Forum (MARF) were positive, thorough and have generated useful contributions to this project. This included the generation and consideration of several design options at different stages of the pre-application process. The Applicant stated that there were comments from MARF in 2018 in favour of redevelopment of the existing heritage asset, hence the scheme was revised.
- 6.8.3 Several officers have been involved in this lengthy negotiation process. The Conservation Team stated in their final comment that the Applicant needs to demonstrate how the public benefits of the proposed development outweigh the harm to or loss of heritage asset and Nascot Conservation Area. This necessitated the submission of a Heritage Statement by the Applicant which was assessed by Places Services (an independent heritage consultant undertaking work for the local planning authority). Place Services found the Heritage Statement and supplementary information inadequate.

## 6.9 s.106 planning obligation and CIL

- 6.9.1 The proposed development is CIL liable.
- 6.9.2 The development proposed in this application is one where, in accordance with saved Policy T26 of the Watford District Plan 2000 and Policy INF1 of the Watford Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy 2006-2031, the Council will normally require the applicant to enter into a planning obligation which provides for a financial contribution towards the variation of the Borough of Watford (Watford Central Area and West Watford Area) (Controlled Parking Zones) (Consolidation) Order 2010 to exclude future residents of the development from entitlement to resident parking permits and vouchers for the controlled

parking zones in the vicinity of the application site. It is necessary to amend the traffic order so as to exclude the occupiers of the development from any entitlement to claim permits for the local Controlled Parking Zone because otherwise the proposed development would be likely to give rise to additional vehicles parking on local streets, thus worsening traffic congestion which would be a reason to refuse planning permission.

- 6.9.3 The proposed development is also one where Hertfordshire County Council, in pursuance of its duty as the statutory Fire Authority to ensure firefighting facilities are provided on new developments and that all dwellings are adequately served by fire hydrants in the event of fire, seeks the provision of hydrants required to serve the proposed buildings by means of a planning obligation. The requirements for fire hydrant provision are set out within the County Council's *Planning Obligations Toolkit* document (2008) at paragraphs 12.33 and 12.34 (page 22). In practice, the need for hydrants is determined at the time the water services for the development are planned in detail and the layout of the development is known, which is usually after planning permission is granted. If, at the water scheme design stage, adequate hydrants are already available no extra hydrants will be needed.
- 6.9.4 The contribution that would be sought by the Council towards the amendment of the Controlled Parking Zones Traffic Regulation Order and the County Council's requirement for fire hydrants meet the tests in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010, and, consequently, these planning obligations can be taken into account as material planning considerations in the determination of the application. Both the Council's approach to seeking the provision of fire hydrants by means of planning obligations are also fully in accordance with the advice set out in paragraphs 203 to 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Council's contribution in the case of the development proposed in this application is £2,000.
- 6.9.5 In addition to the above, the provision of 10% shared ownership flats (3) and a viability review mechanism would also be required as part of the s106. However the applicant has not agreed to provision of 3 shared ownership flats or a review mechanism.

## 7. Consultation responses received

### 7.1 Statutory consultees and other organisations

Name of Statutory Consultee / Other Organisation	Comment	Officer Response
--	---------	------------------

Hertfordshire County Council (Highway Authority)	The Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to conditions.	Noted
Hertfordshire County Council Growth and Infrastructure Unit	Hertfordshire County Council's Growth & Infrastructure Unit do not have any comments to make in relation to financial contributions required by the Toolkit, as this development is situated within Watford's CIL Zone and does not fall within any of the CIL Reg123 exclusions. Notwithstanding this, the Unit reserves the right to seek Community Infrastructure Levy contributions towards the provision of infrastructure as outlined in your R123 List through the appropriate channels.	Noted
Hertfordshire County Council (LLFA)	The drainage strategy is based upon tanked permeable paving and discharge into Thames Water surface water sewer. The LLFA note surface water calculations have been provided and ensure that the drainage strategy caters for all rainfall events up to and including 1 in 100 plus 40% for climate change with 5 l/s discharge to surface water sewer. The LLFA therefore recommend conditions to be attached should planning permission be granted.	Noted
Hertfordshire County Council Growth and Infrastructure (F & RS)	Based on the information provided to date, the F & RS would seek the provision of fire hydrant(s), as set out within HCC's Planning Obligations Toolkit. F & RS reserve the right to seek Community Infrastructure Levy contributions towards the provision of infrastructure as outlined in your R123 List through the appropriate channels.	Noted

<p>Hertfordshire County Council (Economic Development)</p>	<p>It is recognised that an earlier planning application (17/01104/FULM and 18/00048/REF) has been approved on appeal on the site of this application. The site has historically been used for employment purposes, although it has not been occupied for a number of years. The inclusion of commercial floorspace on the ground and first floor of the proposed scheme is welcomed. Any future revision to this planning application that would seek to remove or reduce the commercial floorspace would not be welcomed.</p> <p>As with all construction projects the Economic Development Team would like to see the applicant commit to developing and delivering on a 'community investment plan' clearly setting out their position on opportunities for local people and the creation and support of a local supply chain for materials, works and services across all stages of the construction process, commensurate with the scale of planned development.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Hertfordshire County Council (Minerals and Waste Team)</p>	<p>Minerals and Waste Team raised issues in connection with minerals or waste matters. Should the Borough Council be minded to permit this application, a number of detailed matters should be given careful consideration.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Waste and Recycling</p>	<p>Access would have to be via St. Albans Road and the service road will need to be resurfaced and maintained to a smooth surface.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Crime Prevention</p>	<p>Although Design &amp; Safety has been listed in the DAS, it does not cover the physical security. Owing to the town centre location and associated</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	crime, it is advised that the development is built to the police minimum security standard Secured by Design.	
Thames Water	No objection	Noted

## 7.2 Internal Consultees

<b>Name of Internal Consultee</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
Historic Environment	Places Services (an independent heritage consultancy) assessed the Heritage Statement and supplementary information and were considered inadequate. The heritage assessment focussed on two heritage assets for consideration are 99 St Albans Road (Locally Listed building Local List Number 167) and the Nascot Conservation Area. The Heritage Statement fails to adequately consider the significance of the locally listed building and the conservation area (Nascot Conservation Area). Places Services stated that the proposed development will result in the total loss of significance to a formally identified non-designated heritage asset which can only be considered harmful. Places Services stated that there were no enough evidence to demonstrate how the adverse harm on the locally listed building and the conservation area would be outweighed by the public benefits from the proposed development.	Noted
Housing Team	Currently the affordable housing offer is not confirmed, making it difficult for the Housing Service to give clear comments. 21 Units would attract 7 units (35%) of affordable housing, 5 x affordable rented tenure and 1 x	Noted

	social rented tenure and 1 x LCHO. The Housing Team is willing to work on habitable rooms. Assuming each 1 bed has 2 habitable rooms and each 2 bed has 3 habitable rooms the site has 53 habitable rooms, 35% of which would be 18 habitable room, or 6 x 2 bed rooms units. These could be 1 social rented 5 x affordable rented tenure, essentially removing the 1 x LCHO unit or possible off-site affordable housing contribution (commuted sum). No affordable housing is offered for this project.	
Environmental Health Team	Unable to locate a noise survey so do you know if one was provided? Also, this site is in close proximity to nearby food businesses where primary cooking takes place and so Odours/ smoke from kitchen extracts have been considered. However, after checking distances on our mapping system, there ought to be sufficient distance for there not to be an issue.	An A1 café is proposed and not a restaurant. Therefore, the issues of odours/smoke and noise are not applicable.

### 7.3 Interested parties

7.4 Letters were sent to 63 properties in the surrounding area. Letters of objection have been received from 25 properties. The main comments are summarised below, the full letters are available to view online:

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
Overdevelopment and overbearing	These issues have been addressed in the report
Loss of outlook, privacy and light	These issues have been addressed in the report
Pressure on car parking	This is a sustainable location, and the site is a short distance from Watford Junction Station and its bus interchange, there are also bus routes as well as range of services in the local shopping centre. It is in a highly accessible location where car free development is appropriate and acceptable in principle.
Too many	The existing commercial uses are located within a shopping

commercial uses in the area	centre where these uses are considered to be suitable.
--------------------------------	--

## 8. Recommendation

That planning permission be refused subject to the following reasons:

1. The proposal, due to the loss of the locally listed building and impact on the Nascot Conservation Area, fails to appropriately preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Nascot Conservation Area and non-designated heritage asset. Furthermore, there is not enough evidence to demonstrate how the benefits of this proposal outweigh the harm or loss of the non-designated heritage asset and the designated heritage area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies SS1, UD1 and UD2 of the Core Strategy and paragraphs 127, 130, 131, 189, 193, 196 and 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In accordance with paragraph 11 (d) (ii) of the Framework, the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development.
2. The proposed development makes no provision for affordable housing and shared ownership housing and no s106 agreement has been completed to secure a viability review upon completion of the development. Consequently, the proposal is not in accordance with Policy HS3 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31 and is contrary to para. 64 of the NPPF in relation to affordable housing provision.
3. It is necessary to exclude the proposed development from the local controlled parking zone in order to ensure that future residents will not be entitled to resident parking permits, thereby preventing any additional on-street parking demand on the surrounding roads. No s106 agreement has been completed to secure this. As such, the proposal is contrary to 'saved' Policies T24 and T26 of the Watford District Plan 2000.