

# THUNDRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

## MINUTES of the THUNDRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL ORDINARY MEETING

Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> July 2022 at 7.30pm in High Cross Village Hall

**PRESENT:** Cllr Steve Bosson (Chairman), Cllr Deryck Dipper, Cllr Kim Saban,  
Cllr Natasha Smyth, Cllr Joyce Spackman, Cllr Martin Spackman, Cllr Brian Taylor  
Mark Wilkinson and David Edwards of FORQ and one member of the public  
Clerk: Colin Marks, Clerk to the Parish Council

Covid-19 risk assessment and risk mitigation:

- Hand gel was available for all participants.
- The wearing of face masks was optional for the meeting.
- Tables and seating were spaced to maintain a reasonable distance between those present.
- Councillors were encouraged to perform a home lateral flow test on the day of the meeting.

The Chairman welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 7.30pm

**ACTION**

### 22.111 Apologies for absence

Parish Councillors: Cllr Brita-May Hawes (work): **Accepted**

Others: Mr Derek Matthews, Mrs Sue Patell; Cllr David Andrews that he could not stay for the meeting due to an appointment.

### 22.112 Declarations of Interest and dispensations

1. **Noted:** that Cllr Steve Bosson, being a trustee, has a non-pecuniary interest in High Cross Village Hall, and a dispensation for all planning matters relating to North Drive and The Glebe Field; that Cllr Brita-May Hawes and Cllr Kim Saban have dispensations for all planning matters relating to North Drive and The Glebe Field; that Cllr Deryck Dipper has a dispensation for all planning matters related to Thundridge Hill, including Ware North development. Cllr Brian Taylor, being a trustee, a non-pecuniary interest on High Cross Village Hall matters.

Cllr Brita-May Hawes and Cllr Kim Saban declared an interest in allotment matters as they are allotment tenants. Cllr Brita-May Hawes also declared an interest in the matter of North Drive lamp post W3, which is located on the edge of her property. Cllr Natasha Smyth declared a DPI in the Nursery and some Pavilion development matters. Cllr Martin Spackman and Cllr Steve Bosson declared DPIs for invoice payments that are to be approved for them.

2. Written requests for dispensations for declarable pecuniary interests: **None**

3. Consideration of requests for dispensations: **None**

### 22.113 Approval of Minutes

**RESOLVED: To approve the Minutes of the 28<sup>th</sup> June Ordinary Parish Council Meeting as drafted.**

**Clerk**

### Suspension of meeting for public comments

**RESOLVED: at 7.38pm to suspend the meeting.**

- A member of the public asked why comments to planning applications are not taken into consideration by EHC Development Management (with specific reference to Ermine Street)? The Chairman replied that the Parish Council, as a statutory consultee, responds to all planning applications, these being recorded in the Planning Decision list on the agenda and Minutes. The parishioner also commented on an apparently unlicensed skip in the Street and commented it was a pity Cllr David Andrews was unable to stay for the meeting.
1. David Edwards and Mark Wilkinson thanked the Parish Council for the opportunity to address the meeting on behalf of the Friends of the Rib and Quin (FORQ). There are only some 300 chalk streams in the world, of which 8 are in Hertfordshire. They emphasised the stress being placed upon the fragile chalk streams in the county - and in this parish in particular - by aggressive water extraction by the water companies, the extraction being increased as housing development continues. 100 houses produce 30 tonnes of sewage per day. Ironically, it is the treated water from sewage treatment plants that keep the rivers flowing. Phosphate testing of river samples has revealed levels four times higher than is the acceptable limit.

FORQ would like the Parish Council to consider sponsoring and supporting its objectives

**The Chairman thanked David and Mark for their report and restored the meeting to order at 8pm**

**22.114 Village Life Magazine**

**RESOLVED: That Cllr Deryck Dipper liaise with Chairman Steve Bosson to write a summary of the Council Meeting for the September edition of the magazine (copy deadline 15<sup>th</sup> August).** The Chairman to submit the article to Village Life.

DD/SB

**22.115 Police report**

No report was received. Regarding the previous speeding complaint on Cambridge Road between Wadesmill and High Cross, Cllr David Andrews said he had used the speed gun at the location but did not record any speeds in excess of 50mph. The police to be asked if they have any other ideas about what can be done to calm traffic speed.

**22.116 Planning**

**1. New Planning Applications**

None received.

**2. Applications received too late for the agenda and other planning matters**

**1. Late applications**

None received.

A request had been received to check with Planning Enforcement the status of steps made to the rear of a property in Eleanors Close and whether a gate onto the lane is required.

Clerk

**2. Ware North update, including Moles Farm flooding issues**

It was noted that the next meeting is on Friday morning, 29<sup>th</sup> July.

**3. Decision Notices. *Noted as set out in the Planning Appendix***

The White Horse decision in particular was noted.

**4. Progress on existing developments underway**

1. Glebe Field: The development continues to progress and all is working well.

SB

2. North Drive speed indicator signs: The possibility of SIDs is being followed up by EHC. It was considered that advisory 20mph signs could be installed in any case.

**22.117 Finance**

*Note: Copy of full Cashbook spreadsheets submitted for following items 1, 2 and 3*

**1. Cashbook Accounts and Reserves to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022**

	Unity Bank	Saffron B/S	Redwood
Cashbook Balance 1 <sup>st</sup> June	56,307.25	82,972.14	84,308.64
Income 1 <sup>st</sup> to 30 <sup>th</sup> June	1,114.58	0.00	0.00
Expenditure 1 <sup>st</sup> to 30 <sup>th</sup> June	3,636.50	0.00	0.00
Cashbook balance 30 <sup>th</sup> June	<u>53,785.33</u>	<u>82,972.14</u>	<u>84,308.64</u>

**RESOLVED: To approve the Accounts as submitted to the Council.**

Clerk

**2. Bank Reconciliation at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022**

	Unity Bank	Saffron B/S	Redwood
Bank Balances 30 <sup>th</sup> May	53,785.33	82,972.14	84,308.64
Unbanked receipts/payments:	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cashbook balances 30 <sup>th</sup> June	<u>53,785.33</u>	<u>82,972.14</u>	<u>84,308.64</u>

**RESOLVED: To approve the Bank Reconciliation as submitted to the Council.**

Clerk

**3. 1. Payments for approval**

*All payments made under the General Power of Competence, LA 2011 s1(1)*

	Gross	Recoverable VAT incl
Sean Macdonald	85.00	
Broadmead Leisure	60.00	10.00
Payplus	31.50	5.25
E.ON	67.59	3.22

Everflow Water	331.28	
Clerk	16.30	
Surrey Hills Solicitors	2,602.00	374.00
Clerk	782.13	
HMRC	92.20	
HMRC	17.51	
S Bosson reimburse	89.65	
Clerk reimburse	5.00	
Busy Lizzies (deposit refund)	1,550.00	
CDA for Herts	36.00	

**RESOLVED: to approve payments as per the Clerk's list presented to the Council, including the Clerk's expenses and additional hours.**

Clerk

**4. Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR) 2021/22**

Status update: With external auditor PKF Littlejohn.

Clerk

**22.118 Norman Wodson Pavilion**

**1. Building Replacement Evaluation Working Group**

**1. Refurbishment procurement contractor tender update**

Cllr Deryck Dipper presented the following comprehensive report:

DD

**Consideration of Procurement Process – July 2022**

**1. Introduction**

This report briefly describes the process followed so far by Thundridge Parish Council to procure a Contractor to undertake Refurbishment Works of its Wodson Pavilion.

It will set out:

- Description of the parish and its key Parish building the Wodson Pavioion.
- Case for investment and appraisal of options fully described in its business case.
- Procurement process leading to the approval of a Preferred Contractor for stage 1 of the works at approximate cost of £70,000 plus VAT..
- Case to consider approving a negotiation with the Preferred Contractor for stage 2 of the works at an approximate further cost of £70,000 plus VAT against an approved budget by the Council.

Having completed stage 1 of the procurement process this report focuses on the approach for stage 2 which because of unavoidable delays has caused stages 1 and 2 to merge into one contract for the summer of 2023.

**2. Case for Investment in the Wodson Pavilion**

2.1 The Wodson Pavilion is a prefab building that was gifted to the Parish Council in the mid 1980s as an amenity for the Parishioners of Thundridge Parish. It is a reasonable size building enabling it to be used for community functions as originally envisaged. It was a second hand building when it was gifted and is over 50 years old. Unfortunately the building is deteriorating and for some years the Parish Council has been saving money towards a potential refurbishment inclusive of repairs

2.2 The Council considered that it should not commit any funds without having carried out a detailed options appraisal. This appraisal has been fully documented in its Wodson Pavilion Business Case which competed options such as do minimum, invest in other services, build a new pavilion as well as refurbish the existing building. The refurbishment option scored the highest of all options as being the most affordable and able to achieve the Council's objectives and was therefore adopted by the Council.

2.3 The Council has a reserve of £167,000 and approved to commit these funds to achieve the preferred option in the business case at its March 2022 meeting. The Council duly placed the business case on its web site seeking comments from the public. There have not been any negative comments to the Council's plans.

2.4 Works – the Council noted it had been in discussion with the Day Nursery to whom the pavilion is leased on weekdays and accepted that the works would need to be limited to school summer holiday periods only. Having taken advice from a local builder it was felt unlikely although not impossible that many potential bidders could manage all of the

works to ensure completion in 6 weeks. That could mean limiting the field of bidders so it was decided that the works would be in two stages:

- Stage 1 – external works - re-roofing and removal and replacing of all external cladding – summer 2022.
- Stage 2 – internal works – replacing all internal ceiling and plaster work and upgrading the kitchen and all electrical appliances – summer 2023.

### 3. Procurement Process to the end of June 2022

3.1 The Council noted that in order to appoint a contractor it should follow an approved tendering process. This would include:

- Appointing an architect to draw plans and write a works specification for the tender document setting out stages of the work.
- Draw up a contract.
- Place the tender documents on Contract Finder.

3.2 The appointment of the architect was agreed by the Council at its March meeting 2022 and he proceeded to draft the works specification for stage 1.

3.3 A JCT Design and Build Contract was drawn up following advice from its architect that the design element should be included. Also the draft contract received from a Town Council for a similar size project (stage 1 + 2 combined) clearly placed the design obligation on the contractor.

3.4 The Tender document was approved by the Council at its April 2022 meeting and immediately placed on Contract Finder.

3.5 Seven potential tenderers applied for the full details but by the deadline of 30<sup>th</sup> May 2022 only one bidder materialised. It has been difficult to learn why such a poor result occurred but some contractors said they were too busy, others referred to the complexity of the contract with design obligations, which the Council now appreciates probably led to only larger contractors feeling able to bid thus reducing the potential field.

3.6 After due consideration the Council selected this tenderer as its Preferred Contractor for stage 1 but before the contract could be completed the contractor advised that he had just received an award of a large schools contract and could no longer resource the job for 2022 summer holiday period. The Contractor advised availability next year.

3.7 The Council noted this position at its June 2022 meeting and decided to consider its options at its July meeting.

### 4. Future Procurement Process

4.1 The Council considers there are two key options:

#### (i) Option 1 – Retender the whole project.

The Council re-tenders the whole project next January to include ALL the works both external and internal. It means completing the works specifications for the internal work and re-drafting the tender documents.

Advantages - This would comply with all due procurement processes. It is an established mechanism to selection of a Contractor. It also provides clear evidence that the Council will have procured the best price for the whole contract.

Disadvantages - It leaves the Council in the same position of uncertainty - will there be an acceptable tender? This would not be known until April or even May next year. So whilst process is perfect, certainty on a result is quite a high risk. Also the uncertainty increases the nearer no contract is signed to school summer holidays. The Council needs to be able to fix a deal 3 - 4 months before school holidays otherwise contractors have this time period committed on school contracts.

#### (ii) Option 2 – Negotiate stage 2 and add to tendered stage 1

The Council has undertaken a robust tendering process for stage 1 (external works) and mentioned the need for stage 2 next year so all bidders could see the possible opportunity for stage 2 works as well as stage 1. However only one bidder responded but the Council has awarded this bidder the status of "Preferred Contractor". It would be possible to negotiate with them for stage 2 advising them

of the Council's budget figure and negotiating to see how the stage 2 work can be added. The Preferred Contractor has indicated they could resource the whole project to be completed in the summer holiday period of 2023 so the idea of seeking a contract for all of the works in one six week period is feasible which confirms to view that a larger contractor could cope. Negotiations could be undertaken in the autumn period and if no agreement is reached by December then the Council would revert to option 1. The Council's Standing Orders and NALC guidance is not detailed on such a process. However the Council's standing financial instructions (SFIs) at paragraph 11d gives the right to waive financial regulations in order to negotiate a price and states what detail the Council should record. This would require completion of the Council's specifications by September 2022. Then negotiations would commence for October so that a result can be declared by mid November to report for a Council decision at the end of November meeting. If a satisfactory result can not be achieved then, the Council will revert to Option 1.

Advantages – the Council would have the possibility of achieving an agreed price within its available funds thus providing certainty. The present situation with difficulties in supplies and the labour situation for contractors is worrying for the Council and a way to achieve certainty could be a major step forward in completing this project. Stage 1 of the project has been tendered competitively on Contract Finder and so the selection of a Preferred Contractor is in accordance with due procurement processes. The addition of the second half of the project (almost the same value as the first half) by a 'budget' negotiation is provided for in the SFIs. If the budget negotiation fails to find a solution then the Council can revert to option 1. It also permits the Council to negotiate with a contractor who is prepared to sign a JCT Minor Works Design and Build Contract.

Disadvantages – only approximately 50% of the project will have been tendered. The final works specification will need to be completed earlier than under option 1.

- 4.2 The Council has sought independent opinion regarding the procurement process for a Refurbishment Works (Minor Works) project which is estimated to cost around £140,000 to £150,000 plus VAT. This is reported in paragraph 5 below.

## 5. Independent Advice

- 5.1 **Independent Adviser** - The Council submitted a request for an opinion from the financial adviser to the HAPTC. A briefing paper similar to this report was provided. The response is set out below:

*I've read this through several times. If the council is seeking meaningful reassurance that they are not acting unlawfully, they need a lawyer's opinion, not mine.*

*The contract is well below the threshold for the full Public Contracts Regulations to apply, but if they publish any further open invitation, they must also publish it on contracts finder.*

*The council also has a duty to secure best value, so they need to consider how they are going to ensure they don't pay more than is necessary if they don't go out to competition. Although the council believes it had a "robust" tender process, it only produced one tenderer who then let them down. That doesn't seem very robust in terms of giving them a clear idea of what they should be paying for the work. Tendering for £150,000 of work may get a different response to tendering for £70,000 of work".*

*This opinion is clearly not in favour of a negotiated approach.*

- 5.2 **Town Council** - The Parish Council has spoken to a Town Council (from where the draft contract design and build was received) and having briefed them on the result of the Council's procurement process asked the following questions.

- (i) As most interested parties did not bid it may have been due to the heavy obligations of a design and build. Does the Town Council sometime use a minor works build only contract without the design obligation. Answer is yes build only contracts are used when the TC has written in full its specifications and is happy to proceed without the design obligation. They suggested in view of the bidder drop out record on our project that the Parish Council should consider dropping

the design contract. The design issues being clear in the specifications means the contractors know exactly what they are required to do – therefore it is important the specs are correct! The TC is sending draft build only contracts for us to review. The Parish Council would need to review the position with its architect and ensure all the works specifications are inclusive of all design elements. This advice is based on our experience of a significant drop out record of bidders.

- (ii) The Town Council was briefed on the idea of having a tendered bid for stage 1 could the PC proceed to negotiate the stage 2 price. The answer is similar to the independent adviser. Such an approach can not robustly defend the question of did the PC get the best price. They stated the view that the PC needs three quotes. The process should start earlier in early January latest. This would mean having all the specifications and contract ready by the November PC meeting.

## 6. Conclusion

The Council needs to decide on the procurement route to be adopted. If it agrees to re-tender the whole contract the preferred contractor status for the bidder on stage 1 needs to be formally withdrawn.

Works specifications need to be completed by the end of September. Discussions should be undertaken with the architect concerning the potential change of contract to non design. A report should be presented to the Council at its September meeting on the non design contract.

DD/SB

## 2. VAT reclaim report

In response to an enquiry the following advice has been received from HAPTC VAT advisor Steve Parkinson:

*“Before answering, I should also draw their attention to the fact that if the land and the building were donated to the council, they may actually be held in trust. That would affect the VAT situation, so the council should check the original documentation if it has any.*

*I think the clerk would benefit from attending one of our VAT courses. They are aware of the £7,500 threshold but I’m not sure they understand how it applies. The £7,500 threshold only relates to VAT exempt business activities (such as the lease of property). It doesn’t affect the council’s non-business VAT, which can be reclaimed regardless of the amount.*

*The council appears to have income of approximately £14,000 a year from the building, which is a VAT-exempt business activity. If the council is going to incur £30,000 of VAT in one year, it can look at the average VAT incurred on the site (excluding any non-business activities) over 7 years. The period can only include 2 estimated years. The council simply needs to do a spreadsheet adding up the VAT incurred on the site for each of the last 5 years, plus a projection for this year and next year, then divide the total by 7 to see if the average is less than £7,500. There is no need to agree anything with HMRC or send them anything. The council just needs to establish that it is entitled to reclaim the VAT before submitting its VAT126 claim.”*

The Clerk noted: i) The pavilion land and building are not held in trust. ii) The Clerk has attended an HAPTC VAT course and VAT was comprehensively covered on the CiLCA course. However, VAT is complex and expert advice is always to be sought on important matters where a lot of public money is under consideration.

## 3. RABI: acquisition of additional land

The Clerk reported that he has not received any responses to his further enquiries.

Clerk

## 4. New Preschool tenant lease contract

The termination of tenancy notice was sent to Busy Lizzies in early July and arrangements are being made for Busy Lizzies to return the keys. A deposit totalling £1,750 is to be returned to Busy Lizzies.

DD/Clerk

## 5. Hirer’s Liability insurance

Zurich have been asked what is covered in the Parish Council’s policy - Part F “Hirers Liability”. Exactly what is covered is not detailed but it should always be the case that the hirer makes their own insurance arrangements. The question arises if an incident occurs where the hirer claims it is the fault of the Parish Council due to some form of negligence

on its part and it is probable that Hirer's Liability would cover the Council should such a case arise, but depending upon the circumstances.

## 2. Highfield Nursery debt repayments

The Clerk noted that the debt repayment of £50 was made in July. The Clerk continues to keep in regular contact with the debtor.

Clerk

### 22.119 Recreation Areas

1. Play area: Safety Report. The July report was received and noted: No action required.
2. The East Herts annual RPII is scheduled for late July.
3. Car Park surface dressing: Cllr Martin Spackman reported that a quote for re-dressing the existing is still awaited.

Clerk

MS

### 22.120 Allotments

#### 1. 2022 tenancies and vacant lot allocation: update and other matters

Cllr Brita -May Hawes sent a report that was noted in her absence. It included matters concerning i) Updates to the Allotments register; ii) In response to dog fouling incidents, a suggestion to put up a sign to say only dogs on leads are to be allowed on the allotments; iii) New fences required between certain plots; iv) An updated Tenancy Agreement to be agreed in time for 2023 renewals.

TAWG  
Clerk

#### 1. 2. Tenancy Agreement payment policy

To be included in the 2023 Tenancy Agreement

TWAG/  
Clerk

#### 2. Tenancy issue and course of action

1. Update on legal proceedings.

**RESOLVED: That in the public interest, this item of business be deferred to the end of the Meeting and that the public be excluded under Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960.**

### 22.121 Highways, Footways and Public Rights of Way (PRoW)

1. North Drive:
  1. Update on removal of lamp post W3: No progress.
  2. Disappearance of the combi-bin at the North Drive/Poplar Close junction: The Osprey site manager to be contacted again.
2. Ermine Street damaged lamp replacement: Still awaiting cost advice from HCC/Ringway.
3. Broken Wadesmill village entrance signs update: No progress. To be followed up.
4. Anchor Lane embankment reinstatement progress update: The latest news is that the work will be completed in early September.

Clerk

Clerk

Clerk

### 22.122 Other matters

1. ACV Working Group: The Feathers: ACV nomination in hand with the Clerk, although other priorities are taking precedence at the moment.
2. Trees in The Pit blocking the light to a flat in Woodland Road: An arborist has been contacted for a price to reduce the height of the trees.

Clerk

MS/Clerk

### 22.123 County and District Councillor report

No report received.

### 22.124 Urgent and other matters not listed on the agenda

**RESOLVED: That Martin Spackman be engaged to lift the clearance height of the trees on the playing field for £200.** This is approximately half the price quoted by the maintenance contractor.

MS

### 22.125 Correspondence (Noted as per the agenda).

- Parishioner: Re hire of venue for children's party
- Further complaint about speeding traffic on Cambridge Road, Wadesmill to High Cross
- HAPTC: VAT reclaim position for pavilion refurbishment. (22.118.1.2)
- Allotment tenant: incident with weed killer (22.120.1.1)
- Allotment tenant: report of water incident (22.120.2)

**22.126 Matters for future agendas**

Clerk/SB  
SB

- Neighbourhood Plan Appendix H action update on outstanding tasks: **agreed to review quarterly.**
- Retain The White Horse as a pub: *The Parish Council raised a strong objection to the recent planning application. However, that planning application has now been approved.*
  - Nominate Community Assets listed in Appendix E of the Neighbourhood Plan: *The Feathers is now being nominated*
  - Make Clarkson Memorial and the information boards more visible and maintain regularly: *Under consideration.*
  - Advertise local history in pubs (with accommodation): *Under consideration with Thundridge and High Cross Society.*
  - Promotion of the Turnpike and Doric columns on Wadesmill Bridge: *Under consideration with Thundridge and High Cross Society.*
  - Seek formal designation of parts of High Cross as a Conservation area: *Ongoing; agreed to send request again.*
- Update: Bircherley Green bus depot re-development
  - Update: Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) re excluding dogs from Norman Wodson Playing Field
  - Parish lighting ownership to be confirmed (new invoice received)
  - Other matters raised: 2023 Allotment Tenancy Agreement to be updated (October 2022)
  - To support FORQ both on the website and with a donation within the constraints of the grants policy.

**22.127 Date and venue of next Council Meeting**

**Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> September, 7.30pm in The Norman Wodson Pavilion.**

Clerk/SB

**EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**22.120.2 RESOLVED: That under Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960, due to ongoing legal involvement, it is in the public interest that the public be excluded for the consideration of agenda item 22.103.2.1.**

*The public were excluded at 8.50pm.*

The Clerk and Chairman reported on their 21<sup>st</sup> July meeting with the solicitor prior to the 3<sup>rd</sup> August Possession Order hearing at Hertford County Court. A barrister will represent the Council and the Clerk is required to attend. The Council was also updated on the current position regarding other court proceedings and related issues.

Clerk  
Clerk/SB

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 9.05pm

Signed..... Dated.....

**APPENDIX A**

**Planning decisions and awaited notices**

<b>3/22/1022/HH</b>	<b>The Drive, 6 Moles Farm:</b> Alterations to roof and fenestration. <i>The Parish Council had no comments</i>	<b>GRANTED</b>
<b>3/21/0731/FUL 3/21/0732/LBC</b>	<b>White Horse Inn:</b> Convert PH into one dwelling; Demolish rear extension; erect new extension. Erect 4 no. 2-bed dwellings. <i>The Parish Council objected</i>	<b>GRANTED</b>
<b>3/22/1169/CLPO</b>	<b>Wodson Pavilion:</b> Replacing cladding and roofing refurbishment. <i>The Parish Council had no comments</i>	Permission required
<b>3/22/1190/HH</b>	<b>Great Henirage:</b> Single storey rear extension, garage conversion and alterations to ground floor fenestration. <i>The Parish Council had no comments</i>	Awaited
<b>3/22/1260/HH</b>	<b>Rennesley Stables:</b> Convert garage and loft for accommodation. <i>The Parish Council had no comments</i>	Awaited
<b>3/22/0582/LBC</b>	<b>Barclay Cottages, Wadesmill:</b> Replacement windows and doors. <i>The Parish Council had no comments.</i>	Awaited



3/22/0557/PNHH	<b>Great Henirage, Cold Christmas Lane:</b> Single storey rear extension. <i>Presumed planning permission not required. The Parish Council had no comments</i>	Permission required
3/22/0426/OUT	<b>Land off Poles Lane:</b> Demolish stable and build house <i>The Parish Council objected</i>	Awaited
3/22/0272/FUL	<b>The Pool House, 11 Ducketts Wood.</b> Demolish dwelling, erect replacement, amend curtilage. <i>The Parish Council had no comments</i>	Awaited
3/22/0350/LBC	<b>Thundridge House, Poles Lane:</b> Internal alterations. <i>The Parish Council had no comments</i>	Awaited
3/21/2533/FUL	<b>Standon Green House:</b> New gates, fence, gazebo, decking, pond with fountains and associated landscaping. <i>The Parish Council objected</i>	Awaited
3/22/0571/HH	<b>Grey Oaks. 13 Ducketts Wood:</b> Insert dormer windows <i>The Parish Council had no comments</i>	Awaited
PL/0243/21	<b>Ware Waste Recycling Centre:</b> Construct Waste Transfer Station. <i>The Parish Council had no comments</i>	No information
3/21/2819/HH	<b>Watermill House, Old Church Lane:</b> Retention of an open sided outbuilding. <i>The Parish Council objected</i>	Awaited
3/21/2798/HH 3/21/2799/LBC	<b>Bankside Cottage, Ermine St:</b> New access, driveway and det. garage. <i>The Parish Council had no objections</i>	Awaited
3/21/2778/FUL	<b>Watermill House, Old Church Ln:</b> Change of use: 4-bay car port to treatment rooms (RETROSPECTIVE) <i>The Parish Council objected</i>	Awaited
3/21/2600/HH	<b>Watermill House, Ermine St:</b> Detached outbuilding retrospective. <i>The Parish Council objected</i>	Awaited
3/21/2405/HH 3/21/2406/LBC	<b>Thundridge House, Poles Lane:</b> Single storey extension for pool; create external door from window. <i>The Parish Council objected</i>	Awaited
3/21/1284/HH 3/21/1285/LBC	<b>Gardener's Cottage, Youngsbury:</b> Extensions, outbuildings, sewage treatment and other works. <i>The Parish Council had no comments</i>	Awaited
E/22/0109/ENF	<b>Land near Fabdens:</b> Enforcement investigation into caravan site	Awaited
E/22/0101/ENF	<b>Oakleys:</b> Enforcement investigation on large metal-frame structure	Awaited
E/21/0241/ENF	<b>Watermill House, Ermine St:</b> Enforcement inv.	Awaited
E/21/0237/ENF	<b>Standon Green End House:</b> Enforcement inv.	Ongoing
E/19/0448/ENF	<b>Land adj to The Bungalow, High Cross:</b> Enforcement inv.	Unknown