

---

**PLANNING COMMITTEE****MINUTES**

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber at Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, on Thursday 21 April 2022 from 7.30pm to 8.30pm.

Councillors present:

Steve Drury  
Raj Khiroya  
Ruth Clark  
Lisa Hudson

Stephen King  
Chris Lloyd  
Debbie Morris  
Alison Scarth  
Stephanie Singer

Also in attendance: Chorleywood Parish Councillor Zenab Hearn

Officers: Claire Westwood, Lauren Edwards-Clewley and Lorna Attwood

COUNCILLOR STEVE DRURY IN THE CHAIR

**PC 140/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alex Heyward and, Keith Martin with the named substitute Members being Councillors Lisa Hudson and Stephanie Singer. There were also apologies for absence from Councillors David Raw and Sara Bedford.

**PC 141/21 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24 March 2022 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Vice Chair.

**PC 142/21 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS**

None received.

**PC 143/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None received.

The Chair read out the following statements to the Committee:

“All Members are reminded that they should come to meetings with an open mind and be able to demonstrate that they are open minded. You should only come to your decision after due consideration of all the information provided, whether by planning officers in the introduction, by applicants/agents, by objectors or by fellow Councillor’s. The Committee Report in itself is not the sole piece of information to be considered. Prepared speeches to be read out

are not a good idea. They might suggest that you have already firmly made up your mind about an application before hearing any additional information provided on the night and they will not take account of information provided on the night. You must always avoid giving the impression of having firmly made up your mind in advance no matter that you might be pre-disposed to any particular view.”

The pre-election period (previously known as purdah) started on 21 March 2022 and the Council are following the recommended practise during this period.

**PC 144/21 21/2427/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement two storey detached dwelling with loft accommodation and associated works at 12 GROVEWOOD CLOSE, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 5PU**

The Planning Officer presented the plans to the Committee and advised that there were no new updates.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Officer responded, stating that Officers had initial concerns with the application as set out in the report and, following this amendments had been made. The Officer now considered that this application complies with policies and guidance hence the Officers recommendation for approval subject to conditions. The Planning Officer also stated there was quite a varied street scene and then presented the street scene for Members to consider and believed this to show that there was quite a bit of variation.

Councillor Debbie Morris stated that this was quite a substantial rebuild as there were two outbuildings already in the grounds and wondered that in view of that fact, would it be appropriate to remove permitted development rights, certainly for outbuildings.

The Planning Officer said this would not be unreasonable and stated they could potential be removed for Class A which is extension to rear of the dwelling and Class E in relation to outbuildings. This would not prevent the homeowner doing those works in the future but would mean that they would have to make a planning application so that it could be fully assessed. Therefore if Members were minded to remove permitted developments rights for the mentioned classes that could be a condition.

Councillor Stephen King agreed with the removal of permitted development rights. Councillor stated that the main concern was with regards to the meditation room above the garage that could eventually become a sixth bedroom.

Councillor Steve Drury mentioned that one of the objections from the Parish Council was the 45 degree splay line, and asked if that had been checked. The Planning Officer responded that this had been addressed in the Officers report. They further stated that there was no intrusion in relation to number 13. Set out at 7.3.4 in the report, there was a slight intrusion in relation to number 11 to the west. The 45 degree line was taken from a point on the joint boundary level with

the rear of the neighbour, which is the strictest interpretation. On other occasions it might be taken from the corner of the neighbouring building, the edge of the window or the centre of the window. If you take it from the boundary it would intrude but the guidance also states we should have regard to other factors such as spacing and in this case because of the spacing of 2.8m, the relatively minimal intrusion and the orientation, whilst there is a slight intrusion, for the reasons set out in the report it is not considered it would be overbearing in terms of loss of light to the neighbour.

Councillor Khiroya wanted to know what changes had been made by the applicant since Chorleywood Parish Council had made an objection.

The Planning Officer advised that Parish Council's objections were set out at 4.1.1 the plans had been amended and the Parish Council re consulted. They gave the following comment that the development was over dominant in the street scene. In the amended plan the applicant reduced the depth of the replacement dwelling, they had removed one of the front and rear two storey projections, essential reducing the massing and bulk. The Parish Council did retain concerns following receipt of the amended plans. However Officers did consider the amended proposal to be acceptable.

Councillor Debbie Morris was happy to move the recommendation if permitted development rights were to be removed for Class A and E. Councillor Lloyd seconded this.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED (in accordance with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report) with an additional condition removing permitted development rights (Classes A and E)

The additional condition wording to read:

Immediately following the implementation of this permission, notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any other revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) no development within the following Classes of Schedule 2 of the Order shall take place.

Part 1

Class A - enlargement, improvement or other alteration to the dwelling  
Class E - provision of any building or enclosure

No development of any of the above classes shall be constructed or placed on any part of the land subject of this permission.

Reason: To ensure adequate planning control over further development having regard to the limitations of the site and neighbouring properties and in the interests of the visual amenities of the site and the area in general, in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted

October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

**PC 145/21 21/2675/RSP – Retrospective: Retention of single storey garden outbuilding at 4 WATERFIELD, HERONSGATE WD3 5BS**

The Planning Officer advised that there had been an additional objection letter which was not referenced in the report from a group of residents with the suggestion that teak should be applied to all elevations.

Councillor Steve Drury wanted to clarify that all Members of the Committee had seen the photographs previously distributed via emails and offered to pass them round for Members to view if needed. Members agreed that the photographs had already been seen.

Councillor Raj Khiroya wished to seek clarification from the Planning Officer on what was being proposed.

The Planning Officer advised it was a retrospective application and presented plans showing the outbuilding which Officers considered acceptable in its current form. The Officer recommendation was that permission be granted for the retention of the outbuilding remained as it was when it previously came to Committee. The Officer further advised that should members consider it necessary to change the appearance of the building, the applicant had confirmed that they would re clad two elevations of the building in teak effect panels. The Planning Officer presented the plans to show Members which elevations this would be. The other two elevations would be painted to match the teak cladding. If Members considered this change necessary to make the proposal acceptable then Officers would require an additional condition requiring that work to be undertaken.

Councillor Stephanie Singer wanted to know what the structure was made from and would it take paint.

The Planning Officer responded that the elevations where paint had been proposed were due to material and the accessibility to the two elevations. The two elevations where paint has been proposed were currently quite well screened due to vegetation. Officers were happy that the work could be carried out. Officers did consider that it would be acceptable without the alterations taking place but if Members were to consider that the application was only acceptable with those alterations it would be teak to all four elevations, paint to two and cladding to two.

Councillor Raj Khiroya wanted to know why we had asked Officers to get in touch with the applicant to comply with original plan, and wondered was this due to the colour.

The Planning Officer advised that there had been concerns about the colour, and Officers had been asked to discuss this with the applicant.

Councillor Chris Lloyd was happy to propose that Planning Permission be Granted with the additional condition, that the changes to the colour be made.

The Planning Officer said that a timeframe would need to be specified and felt that 2 months was a reasonable amount of time. The condition would also need to include the maintenance of the structure.

Councillor Chris Lloyd wished to propose a longer timeframe than 2 months and suggested a 6 month period would be fairer as Officers would want to enforce after 2 months and this was not a great amount of time.

Councillor Debbie Morris agreed that a longer time period than 2 months should be agreed.

Councillor Raj Khuroya asked for further clarification about why the sides could not all be the same materials.

The Planning Officer stated that the other sides were a ceramic fire retardant material. This would achieve the affect that it would seem Members wanted which would be teak on all four elevations.

Councillor Lloyd proposed that the Officers recommendation was accepted with the 6 month timeframe included in the conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Stephen King.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 8 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstain.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED (in accordance with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report) but with an additional condition requiring changes to external colour (teak cladding to north west and north east elevations and teak pain to south west and south east elevations) to be made within 6 months and thereafter maintained.

The additional condition wording to read:

Notwithstanding the existing building/details on drawing 001 E, within six months of the date of this permission, the north western (facing the house) and north eastern (facing the driveway / entrance to the driveway) elevations of the outbuilding hereby permitted shall be physically altered to include the application of outdoor composite wall cladding "New Tech Wood Ultrashield" (referred to as TRDC001) in the colour 'teak' as detailed within page 5 of the specification TRDC001 and the south western and south eastern elevations shall be painted in a colour to match the reclad elevations. Once applied, the new facing materials shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter in terms of colour.

Reason: This condition is required to ensure the outbuilding is amended so it has an acceptable visual impact on the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

**PC 146/21      22/0244/FUL- Single-storey side and rear extension and construction of raised patio at 245 UXBRIDGE ROAD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTS, WD4 8DP**

The Planning Officer advised that there was no update.

Councillor Debbie Morris wanted to ask about the report section 7.2.4 which stated the single storey rear extension may result in some loss of late evening sun to the private patio area. Councillor wanted to ask if this would happen and if the Officer could explain how the neighbour would be impacted.

The Planning Officer responded that the orientation of the application site and the adjacent neighbour is due south when the sun sets there would be some loss of light to their patio just by virtue of that orientation. There was an existing small boundary wall that sits between the application site and the neighbours dwelling. In the evening time there would be some shadowing from that wall anyway, there may be some further shadowing from that extension. Some loss of light to that patio would not be unacceptable. Therefore whilst there would be some loss of light it would not be detrimental due to the site circumstances and the fact that it would only be late evening sun.

Councillor Steve Drury asked if the original issue with regard to the neighbour had been resolved.

The Planning Officer responded that, the neighbour had objected originally, however once the amended plans had been received (which brought the overall depth of the extension in compliance with appendix 2 and also made reference to the patio) the neighbour was re consulted and received a telephone call from the Planning Officer to ensure they were aware of the amendments but there were no further objections or comments received. It was understood they still had some concerns regarding the party wall but this was not a material planning consideration.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked following the scheme amendment could the extension be built under permitted development.

The Planning Officer advised that it could not, due to the height. The maximum height may be compliant but when you reach the eaves height because of the change in levels it might not be permitted development. It is 3.6 meters therefore they would require prior approval because it was a semi-detached property. Councillor Debbie Morris responded that 3.6 meters is within the guidelines.

Councillor Ruth Clarke moved that Planning Permission be Granted, this was seconded by Councillor Alison Scarth.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the in accordance with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

**PC 147/21      22/0425/FUL- First floor front extension, loft conversion including increase in ridge height, rear dormer windows, front rooflights, front**

**porch and alterations to fenestration at 69A HIGHFIELD WAY,  
RICKMANSWORTH, HERTS, WD3 7PP**

The Planning Officer had no update.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke against the application.

The Planning Officer wanted to respond to the two main points raised by the objector in respect of overlooking. The primary concern was from the dormer window which would be sited in the side elevation, which would be in the first floor of the garage extension. This would be the games room. Due to the separation distances and the fact that it was orientated at 90 degrees any views would be oblique and not be directly towards the bedroom window. In respect of the rear dormer there were already existing first floor windows within the property at present which could afford views towards the neighbour's extension. In light of the existing situation it was not considered that there would be any additional significant adverse overlooking, which would result in detrimental harm to neighbours amenity.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked if the separation distance was approximately 23 meters or 8 meters.

The Planning Officer responded that it was 8m from the flank of first floor extension to the front boundary with the neighbour number 69. The 23m distance related to the relationship with properties to the rear. The Planning Officer presented the plans and pointed out the separation distances for Members of the committee.

Councillor Debbie Morris expressed concerns about the scheme. There was nothing in the report that mentioned any other houses of those proportions in the vicinity. Councillor noted what the objector had talked about this being one of the largest houses on one of the smallest plots. The plans show the ridge height was significantly higher than its neighbours. The photos also showed how prominent the garage was. Imagining a first floor extension on that, in context of street view would be quite bulky and dominant. Some of the concerns raised by the Parish council were: too close, overbearing, size and scale, over dominant to street scene. This struck a chord with Councillor Debbie Morris, it was understood that the first floor extension would be a depth of 6.3 meters and a height of 6.3 meters, this would be very substantial and Councillor was concerned and wished to hear other Members views.

Councillor Raj Khuroya stated that each application should be judged on its own merit and could not be compared to anything else. The Councillor also stated that he had heard a comment that there was not anything else like this on Highfield Way to which he disagreed.

Councillor Stephen King asked if we would be able to remove permitted development rights on the over garage room to stop it from becoming another bedroom in time. The Planning Officer responded that the site had policy

compliant parking and ample amenity space to serve the application site even if the games room were to be converted. In order to remove permitted development rights we would need to show what the harm would be if it were to be changed into a bedroom. In the view of the Planning Officer it would not be reasonable to add a condition to ensure it was retained in that use.

Councillor Steve Drury asked if the flank window on the games room could be obscured. The Planning Officer responded that if it meant that the development would be acceptable to members, solely by using that condition then in theory, yes it could be added. The Officer did not believe, in their personal view, that it was necessary and advised that any condition would have to satisfy the test set out within the NPPF. Any conditions that were added to permissions could be appealed by the applicant. If Members considered it necessary a condition could be added, the window could be obscurely glazed with top opening only or just obscurely glazed.

Councillor Drury stated that this may or may not change the objectors view slightly if the glass was obscured. With regard to the neighbours lantern roof there had been more of these introduced in recent times. There had been a proposal to recommend this application, Councillor would be happy with the amendment to add obscured glass to flank window to alleviate some of the concerns.

Councillor Lisa Hudson asked if the lantern roof could be obscured. Councillor Steve Drury said he had not seen an obscured lantern roof before. Councillor Steve Drury said we would have to obscure the neighbour's lantern roof which we could not ask the neighbour to do. Councillor Lisa Hudson asked if we could put a condition in to obscure the window that overlooks the neighbour.

The Planning Officer advised the windows that were of concern for potential overlooking to the neighbours roof lantern were from the dormer windows, which were at second floor level within the rear elevation. The existing first floor window could look onto that neighbours lantern as existing. Therefore there was an existing degree of overlooking. The Planning Officer did not think it would be reasonable to condition the dormer window at second floor level to be obscure glazed.

The Planning Officer then presented the plans on screen to explain why they didn't feel that it would be reasonable and reminded members that they could only add a condition if it met the tests. The Officer showed one window in the games room which had potential to cause harm from overlooking, it could be conditioned to be obscured glazed and/or top opening if members felt it was necessary.

Councillor Steve Drury asked for the plans to be shown by Officers for the front elevation. The Planning Officer presented the plans on screen for the Committee.

Councillor Raj Khuroya proposed to move the recommendation that planning permission be granted if the dormer window could be obscure glazed.

The Planning Officer asked Members to clarify that the window would be obscured glazed and top opening casement as it was standard to have both.



Councillor Steve Drury was happy to go ahead with the recommendation of obscured glazed and top opening casement. This was seconded by Councillor Stephen King.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 7 For, 2 Against and 0 Abstention

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report but with an additional condition requiring flank window over garage to be obscure glazed and top opening only.

The additional condition wording to read:

The additional first floor dormer window within the south eastern flank serving the 'games room' shall be fitted with purpose made obscured glazing and shall be top level opening only at 1.7m above the floor level of the room in which the window is installed. The window(s) shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

The Chair wished to say that they had thoroughly enjoyed the past year as Chair and wanted to thank all Members for their support and Officers for all their hard work. Councillor Chris Lloyd proposed thanks to Councillor Alison Scarth for the contribution they had made to the Committee as this would be the Councillor's last meeting on the planning committee. The Committee were in agreement.

Councillor Raj Khiroya added that Councillor Drury had done a fantastic job as Chair.

Chair