

Location: Land Between Bush Wood And Rokey Wood
High Street
Reed
Hertfordshire

Applicant: K.D Duke & Partners C/O Agent

Proposal: Retention of 5,500 cubic metres of inert soils for an engineering operation to create an agricultural reservoir

Ref. No: 22/00910/FP

Officer: Anne McDonald

Date of expiry of statutory period : 29.06.2022

Reason for Delay

The application has had the statutory date extended to 30th October 2022. The delay has been due to the wait for a committee meeting.

Reason for Referral to Committee

The application is being presented to Planning Control Committee due to the requirements of the scheme of delegation which requires for applications for 'operational development' with a site area larger than 1 ha to be presented to PCC for determination. This application has a site area of 2.7 ha thus making this a committee decision.

Furthermore the application has been 'called in' to committee by Cllr Morris on the basis the Reed PC has raised several objections.

List of Plans

Location Plan;
Existing site plan – C545/4;
Proposed plan – C545/3.

1.0 Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework February 2019:

1.2 In general and with regard to:

Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development;
Section 6 – Building a strong, competitive economy;
Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

1.3 **North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No.2 with Alterations**

Policy 6 – Rural Areas beyond the Green Belt.

Policy 16 – Areas Archaeological Significance and other Archaeological Areas.

1.4 **North Hertfordshire District Local Plan 2011-2031 'Submission Local Plan and Proposals Map**

Policy SP5 – Countryside and Green Belt

Policy CGB1 – Rural Areas beyond the Green Belt;

Policy HE4 – Archaeology.

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 Application 18/02235/AG proposed the creation of a 2.5 ha reservoir to store water for irrigation. The report sets out that surface area of the reservoir is to be 2.5ha with bund of 4 – 5m around it. This application concluded that prior approval was not required.

2.2 Application 19/010955/LDCP was for 'Engineering operation to create an agricultural reservoir'. This was granted on the basis that the works were considered to comply with Part 6, Class A of the GPDO. This proposal was for the importation of 45,000 cubic metres of materials forming a reservoir with a capacity of 24,000 cubic metres. This application showed that the reservoir would be filled by surface water runoff alone.

2.3 Applications 12/02365/1, 13/00840/1 and 13/01257/1 were all for the solar farm which is opposite one end of the application site area for the reservoir.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **NHDC Environmental Health** – there is low likelihood of environmental risk from ground contamination. No objection.

3.2 **HCC Archaeology** – no objection subject to a condition which is recommended. HCC Archaeology comment:

"The proposed development site is in an Area of Archaeological Significance identified in the Local Plan. This denotes the historic village of Reed and a large number of medieval moated sites. These include a well-preserved medieval moat and hollow way, located immediately to the west of the site, in Bush Wood [Scheduled Monument - List Entry 1017608, Historic Environment Record No 1924]. The site of a possible medieval motte and bailey known from cropmarks/earthworks lies immediately north of Rokey Wood [HER 855]. In 1743 a hoard of Roman bronze and silver objects, comprising seven silver tablets or thin plates, a bronze figure of Mars and a bronze knife was found in Rockley or Rokey Wood [HER 2233]. In 2009 two cross-sections of a ring ditch, about 30cm deep and 70cm wide, containing flint-gritted probably Bronze Age pottery were recorded when a modern drainage ditch was cut along the farm track on the northern boundary of the site [HER 17747].

The proposed development site therefore has a high potential for archaeological remains dating to the prehistoric and medieval periods, in particular. The same conclusion is also reached in the archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) submitted with the application (Archaeological Solutions Ltd, Proposed Solar Farm [sic], Wisbridge Farm, Reed, Hertfordshire. An Archaeological Desk-based Assessment & Walkover Survey, May 2019).

I note that a substantial quantity of inert material has already been spread over the northern part of the development site. The DBA states that the site 'is stripped bare in its southern section and overlain with imported material within its northern section'. It is likely that the importation of this material may have already had some impact upon any below ground archaeological remains present. It is unclear exactly what further impacts would be involved in the construction of the reservoir, but the DBA (7.5) states 'The proposed construction of the reservoir will comprise the stripping of the existing topsoil and the importation of material to build up the reservoir rather than excavation and truncation of the site. The banks of the proposed reservoir will be built along all four boundaries, rising by approximately 4m above the existing ground level. The proposed stripping of the existing topsoil and the importation of material to build up the reservoir could impact archaeological remains, if present, but this impact could be mitigated for example by not tracking on exposed soils. Furthermore, should the application for the retention of the inert soils not gain planning consent, leading to the removal of the material, this could also cause disturbance to the site'.

- 3.3 **Environment Agency** – no objection. The applicant should note that an abstraction licence will most likely be required.
- 3.4 **Anglian Water** – no comment as the development does not meet their threshold requirements of being either a development for 10 or more dwellings or a commercial or industrial development with a floorspace of 500 sqm or greater.
- 3.5 **Reed Parish Council** - object to the application and have provided detailed comments. These are attached at Appendix 1. The chairman of Reed PC has provided a historical background to this application which is included in this report for information purposes. This background is:
- *An application was made to NHDC as PA back in the summer of 2019 for a Certificate of Lawfulness. It was retrospective in that lorryloads of soil were being imported to the site from 2018.*
 - *A COL was to confirm that importing soil for agricultural engineering works was legitimate permitted development. The said engineering works were construction of an agricultural reservoir. The supporting statement presented by Savills for the COL application detailed the need to import 45,000 cu m of material to construct a 25,000 cu m capacity reservoir. The justification given for the reservoir was identical to that offered in the present application (22/00910/FP).*
 - *Despite being lobbied for an immediate decision by the agent and the solicitor for Searo (the contractor involved) Richard Tiffin as case officer acted with due diligence and insisted on evidence that a reservoir on the site was viable - ie that it could be supplied with water. This assurance he received in the form of an expert water report. Accepting expert advice he duly and quite properly issued the COL in September 2019.*
 - *Importation of soil thereafter continued and then throughout the first lockdown. By autumn of 2020 the site had been transformed into one resembling a first world war battlefield. The overall level of the field had been raised and disordered and unconnected banks were distributed about the site to absorb the 45,000 cu m of imported soil. All work then stopped.*
 - *It became apparent that the expert water report submitted in 2019 was made by the applicant without consultation with the Environment Agency.*
 - *Through copious correspondence between Barkway and Reed Councils and the EA, the latter made clear that they would not licence water extraction from boreholes in*

surrounding ditches as proposed in the 2019 Water report. This meant that the proposed reservoir of 25000 cu m capacity could not be filled by extraction. Given that rainwater could never fill it, it became unviable as a reservoir, which amongst other things effectively rendered void the COL for the enterprise - which was predicated on it being an agricultural permitted development. A reservoir is an agricultural permitted development but an unfilled reservoir is presumably not. EA required the Agents and the Owners to present alternative proposals on water. No such proposals were, to my knowledge, presented to EA. However, this planning application has now emerged.

- The inactivity on the site for the last year and a half has allowed the site to re-wild naturally. That in turn has motivated Reed PC (and possibly also Barkway) to desist from lobbying EA, the developer and indeed North Herts about the reservoir and the importation of soil. Even if the effect of the imported soil being present (without a reservoir) was that it was effectively a waste transfer, it was felt that the site was being naturally rehabilitated and no longer quite a disfigurement of a beautiful landscape. Parishioners could live with it especially as no water was being siphoned from runs that fed the River Quinn and other water courses.

3.6 Further to this background, the PC raised 5 queries. These were put to the agent and responses received. This information is set out below under the proposal section of this report.

3.7 **Barkway Parish Council** – objects to the application for the following reason:

“This seems to be a significantly flawed application in that the claimed supply to fill and refill the “reservoir”, from precipitation, would be wholly insufficient to do that. We understand that rain would barely cover the bottom, let alone fill the whole on a continuing basis. We also understand that the exterior might not even hold the water in, by virtue of the permeability of the materials. Extraction of water to fill this “reservoir” has not been proposed but we know from the previous application that it would not be licenced for this site by the Environment Agency (being a designated area of water shortage). It brings into question – what this application is really for, as there is no rationality for it when it is surrounded by a Solar Farm and woods. In the opinion of Barkway Parish Council, this application lacks critical information for North Herts Council to be able to make an informed determination.

The impact on Barkway should also be taken into account. If the flow of water is interrupted or reduced by going into this “reservoir”, that will inevitably reduce the flow of water into the water features in the village. These include the ancient Wagon Wash, which is a historical feature and also home to protected wildlife. It is also part of a natural water course which ends up in the protected historic ancient chalk stream of the river Quin.

We would also ask what is the plan for the existing materials moved onto the site since 2018 to build the previously planned “reservoir”. Is this to be removed? Currently this dumped material is marring what had previously been a beautiful landscape”.

3.8 The application has been advertised with a site notice. Replies have been received from one neighbour, Cllr Morris and the Friends of the Rib and Quinn.

3.9 Friends of the Rib and Quinn – we are concerned as to how such a reservoir would be filled and how that might impact the aquifer and thereby the rivers / ponds / streams in this part of the catchment.

3.10 Neighbour comments:

- There has been no obvious attempt to create an agricultural reservoir since the materials was dumped there resulting in the site being an eyesore for several years.
- It is now being used by scrambler bikes which are a hazard to the adjacent footpaths.
- If the site granted permission then the site should be levelled or securely fenced.

3.11 Cllr Morris:

- There is local confusion why someone would want to create a reservoir which can only be filled by rainwater when this will never fill.
- There is a local concern that this reservoir is to be filled with liquid from an anaerobic digester and then used as a fertiliser.
- Whilst the production of home grown fertilizer is supported due to the cost rise of fertilizer and it can be regarded as being more sustainable due to it having a small carbon footprint, there is a concern that this could leach into the locality and be a source of pollution.
- In the event this application is recommended for approval, conditions needs to be imposed preventing any more material from being imported on to the site and ensuring the surplus material is landscaped.
- The existing site material is primarily chalk and would retain water. The reservoir would need to be lined in clay or with a waterproof membrane. This is not explained in the proposal nor is there any explanation or detail of the infrastructure that will be needed to irrigate the fields.
- Page 4 of the statement says that the reservoir can be filled by rainwater and would not require abstraction. I assume that by rainwater it is suggesting that there will be no other method of filling the reservoir. Whatever its depth with evaporation it is obvious that the reservoir will never be filled. Any body of water needs a method of filling it in addition to direct precipitation. A river, stream, borehole or adjacent land sloping towards it. This reservoir has none of these.
- Clearly the method of filling the reservoir by rainfall is unrealistic. Whilst abstraction is not being requested. You will see from the Environment Agency correspondence that abstraction would be permitted for the original larger reservoir at a volume of 20 m³ or less of water per day. The current retrospective application says that this reservoir will have a water volume of 5500 m³. Therefore it would take 275 days to fill the new reservoir. That is without using the water or any evaporation. Very clearly unrealistic by whatever method.
- The supporting statement makes much of the environmental benefit of this structure. I would suggest that the reverse will be the case, in that it will become an unnecessary eyesore, potentially dangerous and add nothing to any biodiversity in the area. Certainly never become a useful method of irrigation.
- This good agricultural land was taken out of use and the imported material left in situ. The site has now grown over and is now probably better left as it is.
- It would appear the imported material is primarily chalk without topsoil, although as I have said nature has attempted to reclaim the area. A better solution may be to level

the land, albeit it would for higher than the surrounding area and then seed it with a mixture of native plants and grasses.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 The application site is an area of open land laying north of the existing solar farm, south of Periwinkle Hill and in between Bush Wood and Rokey Wood. There is an existing farm track running along the north, down the east and past the south side of the application site area. The area has previously had soil imported on to it, which is banked in a rough 'U' shape down the east and west side and along the north side of the area. This has largely grassed over and has a fairly natural appearance in the locality.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 The description of development is 'agricultural reservoir and associated works'. Submitted in support of the application is a Planning Statement. This states:

- *This is a retrospective application for the retention of 5,500 CUm3 cubic metres of inert soils for an engineering operation to create an agricultural reservoir at Wisbridge Farm.*
- *The site comprises land which was formerly cultivated arable land directly between Bush Wood and Rokey Wood. An access track runs directly past the north and south of the site. The site is located to the north of the Wisbridge Solar Farm. It is due west of the village of Barkway and due east of the village of Reed. Views into the site are limited from the north and south, with Rush and Rokey Wood providing extensive screening from the east and west. Inert material (soil) was moved onto the site in 2018 following an application for prior approval for an agricultural reservoir (reference: 18/02235/AG).*
- *The site lies adjacent to 'Bush Wood moated site and hollow-way' scheduled monument.*
- *The site is located in an area designated as Flood Zone 1 and therefore has a low probability of flooding.*
- *The proposed development would comprise the creation of a hectare reservoir to store water for the irrigation of arable crops grown by the farming business. It is anticipated that the reservoir would be approximately 5,500 CUm3 in capacity, with the works involved including excavation, with moved material already on site being used in part to create the banks of the scheme. In recent years the effect of climate change has been seen on the farm, with very dry springs which effect spring crop establishment and winter crop development, all of which lead to seriously reduced crop yields by as much as 40-50%. Furthermore in order to reduce risk caused by imposed trade tariffs following the UK exiting Europe, the farming policy is being reconsidered. Apart from the traditional arable crops which benefit from small quantities of irrigation, the farm is considering high value crops such as strawberries, market garden vegetables and small seed production. The UK government, through DEFRA, are promoting the more sustainable storage and use of water on farms for the purpose of crop irrigation and therefore the creation of a small reservoir falls within these Government plans, but would be self-funding rather than being grant aided through a competitive tendering process.*
- *Further to the planning history, it was the view of NHDC that the works on site went beyond what was allowed under permitted development rights and the applicant was advised to submit a retrospective application.*
- *The proposed development is necessary for the purposes of agriculture, storing water for use by the farming enterprise. This is in accordance with the policy of the emerging*

Local Plan and is further supported by the NPPF. The reservoir can be filled by rainwater and would not require abstraction

- 4.2.2 The ecological survey confirms that the proposed development presents an opportunity to create new beneficial habitats at the Site. The report recommends measures to benefit the biodiversity of the area, including:
- Buffer zones to Rokey Wood and Bush Wood to be fenced off following completion of works allowing natural woodland regeneration in the buffer zones.
 - A line of native trees should also be planted to create a green corridor linking the two woodlands.
 - The outer banks of the new reservoir to be seeded with species-rich neutral grassland mix.
- 4.2.3 The design of the proposed development has been informed by the practical considerations of the site and the agricultural needs of the farming enterprise. The proposed reservoir would not only enable water storage, but would also improve the biodiversity of the site.
- 4.2.4 As set above, following the receipt of the Reed PC objection, further clarification was sought from the agent. Five questions were asked and a response was provided. These are:

1. *Is this figure of 5500 cu m of soil correct?*

Response: For clarification, it is the capacity of the reservoir that would be 5,500 cu m of water. The amount of soil required to create the reservoir is 11,936 cu m, all of which is already on site. The existing material would be reprofiled to create the proposed reservoir.

2. *This is a considerable reduction on the 25,000 cu m capacity originally proposed in 2019. But can even a 5500cu m reservoir served only by rainwater ever be viably supplied with water on this site - in what is an EA designated area of water shortage? Would the supply of water be a material consideration for the PA in this application?*

Response: It is envisaged that the reservoir can be filled via

- *rainwater;*
- *from the adjoining fields' land drains running into the two main adjacent carrier ditches; and*
- *through rainwater catchment from the farm's main grain store.*

It is proposed that abstracted water would only amount to 20 cu m per day, the amount allowed under the Environment Agency's legislation.

3. *Taking the information offered in the application at face value, how can 5500 cu m of imported inert material be enough material to construct a reservoir of 5500cu m capacity*

Response: Following the previous consents, 11,936 cu m of soil was brought onto the site. No further material will be imported and it has been calculated that this quantity of material will be sufficient to construct a reservoir of 5,500cu m.

4. *What then happens to the rest of the 45000 cu m of material already imported to the site? Does the status of 35,500 cu m become 'waste'? Will it be removed?*

Response: The contractor involved in the movement of the inert material has confirmed that there is 11,936 cu m on site. There is no intention to bring further

material onto the site as there is sufficient to create a well-constructed reservoir which will enhance the security of crops in a dry spring/summer season. Therefore, there is no additional material to remove.

5. *Taking into account the natural rewilding currently rehabilitating the appearance of the site, what guarantees would the PA have that the landscaping measures proposed in the present application would be implemented? And over what timescale?*

Response: The proposed reservoir would have the banks grassed down and the area surrounding will have flower mixes established to enhance the environmental features complementing the new reservoir. As soon as the reservoir has been constructed, the grassing down and seeding will take place providing that there is sufficient soil moisture to ensure a good take. A planning condition to control the timing of the landscaping works would provide comfort to the LPA that these would take place at the appropriate time.

- 4.2.5 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has also been submitted with the application. This concludes that the development presents an opportunity to plant a green corridor of native trees linking Rokey wood and Bush Wood with the outer banks of the reservoir being planted with a species rich neutral grassland mix.

4.3 Key Issues

- 4.3.1 The key issues in this instance are whether these type of works in the rural area acceptable, and whether there would be an adverse impact in the locality from the works.

Principle

- 4.3.2 Saved Policy 6 of the Local Plan 1996 states that in the rural area beyond the Green Belt the Council will maintain the existing countryside and a development proposal (outside of the selected villages) will normally be allowed only if:

it is strictly necessary for the needs to agriculture, forestry or any proven need for local community services, provided that:

- a. the need cannot practicably be met within a town, excluded village or selected village, and*
- b. the proposal positively improves the rural environment; or*
- ii. it would meet an identified rural housing need, in compliance with Policy 29; or*
- iii. it is a single dwelling on a small plot located within the built core of the settlement which will not result in outward expansion of the settlement or have any other adverse impact on the local environment or other policy aims within the Rural Areas; or*
- iv. it involves a change to the rural economy in terms of Policy 24 or Policy 25.*

- 4.3.3 This policy is carried through to the emerging Local Plan with Policy CGB1. This policy states:

In the Rural Areas beyond the Green Belt, as shown on the Proposals Policies Map, planning permission will be granted where provided that the development:

- a. is infilling development which does not extend within the built core of a Category B village;*
- b. meets a proven local need for community facilities, and services or rural*

affordable housing in an appropriate location;
c. is strictly necessary for the needs of agriculture or forestry;
d. relates to an existing rural building;
e. is a modest proposal for rural economic development or diversification; or
f. would provide land or facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and cemeteries that respect the generally open nature of the rural area.

- 4.3.4 As set out above, this proposal is for agricultural purposes to provide water for irrigation for the farm for both existing crops and due to the farm wishing to increase the production of market gardening type produce. As a result, this proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of both Saved Policy 6 and emerging Policy CGB1 and there is no objection raised to the principle of this application.

Detailing considerations

- 4.3.5 The plans show that the reservoir is to be positioned within the northern half of the land area, and is an area (from the outside of the mounds) approximately 105m by 105m. The rest of the land area is to be levelled with ground level in this area raising from the natural ground level of 149 in the area along the access track on the south side to 150.8 just to the south of the southside mound edge. The reservoir banks are to be a maximum of 155 with an anticipated maximum water level of 154.

- 4.3.6 Whilst the application sets that the works are to be done using the existing material on site and that no new material will be needed to be imported. The agent has been contacted seeking clarification on how the reservoir would hold the water and how it would be filled. The response by email dated 27/09/22 states:

"I can confirm that the reservoir would be lined with clay which is already on site (included within the imported material). No artificial material would be used to line the reservoir.

In relation to the water, in addition to rainfall, this would come into the reservoir via the network of connecting ditches that cross the agricultural land. Runoff from the roof of the farm's grain store would also be collected and piped into the reservoir. Water would be pumped out into a sprayer for use on the surrounding agricultural land".

- 4.3.7 I consider that this clarifies this issue and a condition is recommended covering this issue in the event that other materials are needed.
- 4.3.8 In my view it cannot be denied that this proposal will have a high degree of visual impact in the locality. Especially initially when the works are undertaken, and the soil is visible before planting has become established on the side of the banks. The high point of the banks is stated (on the proposed plans) to be datum point 155.00. The ground level of the footpath on the northern side is stated to be 151.35 – 152.29 and the high point of the bank is set 16m – 22m in from the footpath / farm access track edge with the land graduating upwards to the high point. On the east side, a similar relationship is proposed. The footpath / farm access on the east side on the proposed plans is stated to be between 150.63 - 151.21 and the 155.00 high point of the reservoir bank walls are set in 16m – 20m from the edge of the east side footpath / access track with the land banking upwards to the high point. Therefore, for those passing by the reservoir, seeing the land increase in height by between 1m – 4m over a distance of 16m – 22m, these earthwork will be visually apparent when passing by.

- 4.3.9 However, just because the works will be noticeable, I do not consider that this a reason to refuse the application for. This is due to the works being contained in a small area

that those in the area will pass by quite quickly and due to the set back of the high point from the footpath / farm access track edge, the works, in my view, will not be visually over bearing or over dominating but more will appear as a grassy hill. Furthermore, due to the location of the reservoir with it being substantially screened by existing trees on two and half sides, there will be no outward / long range harm extending into the countryside. Whilst the lane will be open leading down to the south edge boundary, due to the distance involved the side banks will just appear as a small hill in the landscape. Given the benefit of the application providing water for farming purposes, I cannot conclude that the visual impact in the locality will be so harmful to justify the refusal of the application for this reason. Furthermore, the planning history sets out that banks between 4m – 5m were agricultural permitted development.

- 4.3.10 The ecology report sets out that the banks of the reservoir will be planted with mixed grasses and wildflowers which is supported and will help to reduce any visual impact in the locality. The ecology report also makes reference to additional tree planting, but this is not shown on the plans and a condition is recommended regarding landscaping details to be submitted and approved and implemented on site.

Other matters

- 4.3.11 I note the concern stated above that the reservoir either will not fill or that it will prevent water from filtering into the local aquifer which will in turn reduce flows into local ponds and streams in the area. The issue of water abstraction and water flows is controlled by the Environment Agency who have advised the applicant that they will need to apply for a licence for these works thus making this a matter that is outside of this application.

Conclusion

- 4.3.12 The application is recommended for condition permission on the basis that the work will result in the site area having a different but acceptable visual appearance in the locality whilst providing a function that is needed for the purposes of agriculture which is development in accordance with the provisions of Saved Policy 6 and emerging Policy CGB1 of the Local Plans 1996 and 2011 – 2031.

5.0 Legal Implications

- 5.1 In making decisions on applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning legislation, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the development plan and to any other material considerations. The decision must be in accordance with the plan unless the material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the decision is to refuse or restrictive conditions are attached, the applicant has a right of appeal against the decision.

6.0 Recommendation

- 6.1 That planning permission GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details specified in the application and supporting approved documents and plans listed above.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with details which form the basis of this grant of permission.

3. Before any development commences on site the landscape details are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the details shall include the following :

- a) what new trees, shrubs, hedges and grassed areas are to be planted, together with the species proposed and the size and density of planting

- b) the location and type of any new fences or other means of enclosure.

Reason: To ensure the submitted details are sufficiently comprehensive to enable proper consideration to be given to the appearance of the completed development.

4. The approved details of landscaping shall be carried out before the end of the first planting season following the completion of the earthworks and any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced during the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority agrees in writing to vary or dispense with this requirement.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the appearance of the completed development and the visual amenity of the locality.

5. Before any works commence on site full details are the following are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) a cross-section plan showing the construction of the reservoir with the clay lining to hold the water in the reservoir.

- b) the details of any equipment or machinery that will be used in association with either filling or using the water to be stored in the reservoir and how often this will be used.

Only the approved details can be implemented on site.

Reason: Full details of the proposal have not been provided at the application stage.

6. A No demolition/development shall take place/commence until an Archaeological Written

Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of archaeological significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording

2. The programme for post investigation assessment

3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording

www.hertfordshire.gov.uk

4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records

of the site investigation

5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation

6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.

B The demolition/development shall take place/commence in accordance with the programme of archaeological works set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A)

C The development shall not be occupied/used until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis and publication where appropriate.

Reason: To protect any archaeological finds on site.

7. For the avoidance of doubt, this planning permission is hereby permitted on the basis that water only is stored in the reservoir and it is used for no other purpose, such as for the storage of any fertiliser based substances.

Reason: To prevent the reservoir from being used for other purposes.

8. No additional material is to be brought on to the site for the construction of this reservoir. Only the imported material already on the site can be used.

Reason: As stated within the application there is already sufficient material on the site for the construction of this reservoir.

9. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted proactively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Proactive Statement

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted proactively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Informative/s:

The applicant is advised that the drainage works to ensure the collection and transportation of water from the grain store building roof to the reservoir may require planning permission.

7.0 **Appendices**

- 7.1 Appendix 1 – Reed Parish Council objection response.

