

---

**PLANNING COMMITTEE****MINUTES**

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber at Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, on Thursday 24 March 2022 from 7.30pm to 8.50pm.

Councillors present:

Raj Khiroya (Vice Chair in the Chair)	Stephen King
Sara Bedford	Chris Lloyd
Ruth Clark	Debbie Morris
Alex Hayward	David Raw
Keith Martin	Alison Scarth

Also in attendance: Batchworth Community Councillor Craige Coren

Officers: Matt Roberts, Adam Ralton, Suzanne O'Brien and Lorna Attwood

COUNCILLOR RAJ KHIROYA VICE CHAIR IN THE CHAIR

**PC 129/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Steve Drury.

**PC 130/21 MINUTES**

Councillor Alex Hayward wished to dispute the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24 February 2022.

Councillor Chris Lloyd wished to move that the minutes were signed as a correct recorded, duly seconded. This was because all Councillors on the Committee had been given the opportunity to comment on them in advance of the meeting.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chair the voting being 6 For, 3 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be signed by the Vice-Chair as the Chair.

**PC 131/21 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS**

Councillor Raj Khiroya advised that Item 9 (21/2675/RSP – Retrospective: Erection of single storey garden outbuilding at 4 WATERFIELD, HERONSGATE, WD3 5BS) had been deferred.

**PC 132/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None received.

The Councillor Raj Khiroya 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 practices during this period.

Councillor Raj Khiroya advised that The Liberal Democrat Councillors wished to declare a non-pecuniary interest in Item 12 which was 21/2901/FUL: Demolition of existing structure and construction of ground floor and lower ground floor rear extension with raised platform to rear at 181 ABBOTS ROAD, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WD5 0BN ). Members of the Committee were not personal friends of the Councillor who was acting as an agent on the application and did not feel there was any conflict of interest.

**PC 133/21      21/1703/FUL - Demolition of the existing dwelling and detached garage, subdivision of site and construction of two dwellings and associated works at DONKEY GATE, CORAL GABLES, SOLESBRIDGE LANE, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 5SN**

The Planning Officer advised that the application had been previously deferred for the submission of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) which had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting. The CMP included restrictions such as: persons to assist all deliveries, vehicle movements to the site, hoardings around the site, specific delivery hours avoiding peak hours, vehicles no longer than 8 meters, trucks or vans only. Tracking had been provided within the CMP, materials were to be offloaded within the main body of the site and parking was also to be inside the main site. Herts County Council (HCC) had no objections to the CMP. Concerns had been received from a local resident, as larger vehicles could not get into Donkey Gate without damaging their wall. Video and photos had been provided showing said damage to wall from a tanker. Another local resident also stated if Officers were minded to approve a number of conditions should be imposed: all permitted development rights are removed, works are restricted from Monday-Friday, previous development demolished prior to the new development taking place, new overstay rights to be granted in respect of No.9 and 10 and foul waste to be disposed of a per current method.

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

Councillor Chris Lloyd asked a question regarding the points raised by the residents and wanted to know if these were reasonable things that could be added as conditions.

The Planning Officer ran through the conditions the member of the public had advised Members should be imposing. The first was that all permitted development rights be removed; part of Condition 10 currently sought to remove Classes A, B and E so that would include extensions to the houses, roof alterations, as well as outbuildings. It does not seek the complete removal of permitted development rights but that would be a number of them which is considered reasonable. Second, in respect of restricting construction works from Monday – Friday, Members would have noted that this had been discussed at a previous Committee meeting for Clovers Court but there were valid reasons for this due to the existing houses being on part of the site that this would have impacted. Therefore it was reasonable to limit construction work to give a bit of leeway at the weekend. With regards to this site there were homes nearby but the site would be well contained and enclosed within the hoardings. There would be no reason to restrict this further than the normal informative which would be Monday-Friday 8am-6pm, Saturdays 9am-1pm. No Sundays or Bank Holidays. The third was regarding any existing development being demolished before any new building takes place. Condition 6 currently sets out that demolition of the existing building should take place prior to the replacement dwelling being built. The reason related to Green Belt so that there would not be more than two occupied dwellings on the same site at any one time. They could implement the new dwelling then but not implement the replacement and this was why it has been drafted in this way. No over-sailing rights was not something that the Council can control, as shown from the site photos the works and movements are going to be inside the site which was well away from the neighbouring boundaries. Foul waste is a Building Control matter therefore does not fall under the planning remit.

Councillor Debbie Morris wanted to ask about the delivery hours, as 8am-1pm is proposed on Saturdays, this would not be in line with the construction hours and felt at the very minimum it should be 9am-1pm and would suggest no deliveries on a Saturday at all as people would be more likely to be at home and parking on the streets. The Councillor felt that this was not unreasonable and a well organised developer could arrange for deliveries in the week.

Councillor Alex Hayward stated that with constraints of the road and the development could all be contained.

The Planning Officer stated that deliveries currently on a Saturday would be 8am-1pm but the condition could be amended to restrict deliveries so that there would be no deliveries on a Saturday.

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 officer report and recommendation) with an amendment to Condition 3 to restrict deliveries to Monday to Friday only.

**PC 134/21 21/2337/FUL – Part single-storey, part two-storey rear extensions including loft conversion and insertion of rear dormers at loft level, alterations to front and flank fenestration including insertion of front dormer window at 3 HEATHSIDE CLOSE, MOOR PARK, HA6 2EQ**

The Planning Officer reported that since the publication of the Committee report Moor Park 1958 had written to Planning Officers and advised that in light of the amendments they would not be speaking at tonight's meeting. They did ask for the wording to be looked at for Condition 3 which was a Construction and Demolition method statement. Condition 3 had been considered and the wording had been updated. An email was circulated to Members with the amended wording but to clarify the wording of the condition would be mean that the applicant would need to submit the Construction and Demolition method statement and that statement needed to include details of how the extension will be implemented whilst retaining all the walls shown on the submitted drawings to be retained and to demolish only those walls expressly shown on the plans to be demolished. This condition would be completely clear that only what is shown on the drawings is to be demolished and nothing further. An informative is also recommended which would remind the applicant if, whilst implementing the works that a risk of additional demolition would take place then work must be stopped and they would need to speak to Planning Officers, as that work would be outside the realms of any planning permission. The second update was to advise that Condition 8 as detailed in the report was incomplete. Condition 8 needed to be updated remove permitted development rights for Class E developments which would be for outbuildings. This meant that should the homeowner wish to construct any type of outbuilding in their garden they would need planning permission first.

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

Batchworth Community Councillor Craige Coren spoke in favour of the application due to the changes that had been made. They stated they were happy with the proposed revised Condition/Informative wording. The type of wording that was proposed to be used is what they would like to see for applications in Conservation Areas throughout TRDC. The Community Council would like to make sure there is regular monitoring of the works so that there is not a situation similar to recent developments where it is discovered that walls had been removed that shouldn't have been, after the event.

Councillor Chris Lloyd advised that having listened to the Officer update and the speakers and following the amendment of the wording they wished to move the recommendation to approve the Officer recommendation (including the updates discussed by the Planning Officer). This was seconded by Councillor Keith Martin.

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 officer recommendation) with amendments to C3 (construction method statement) and C8 (permitted development rights removal) and a new informative relating to C3.

The revised wording for Conditions 3 and 8 to read:

Condition 3:

No development or other operation shall commence on site until a Construction & Demolition Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This Construction & Demolition Method Statement shall include details of how the extensions hereby permitted will be implemented whilst retaining all existing walls (internally and externally) and roofslopes shown on drawing numbers 5750-EL003 Rev N & 5750-PL002 Rev P to be retained (i.e. hatched in grey (marked as existing)) and demolishing only those walls and roofslopes shown on the abovementioned drawings as proposed for demolition as shown dashed in orange.

The development shall thereafter only be implemented in accordance with the approved Construction & Demolition Method Statement.

Reason: To ensure that the original pre-1958 dwelling is retained in accordance with the Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted 2006)

Condition 8

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 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 135/21      21/2597/FUL - Demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of replacement two storey dwelling with loft accommodation served by rear dormer window at 32 CROFTERS ROAD, NORTHWOOD, HA6 3ED**

The Planning Officer advised that there was no update.

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

Batchworth Community Councillor Craig Coren spoke in favour of the application following the new drawings being submitted although there were a couple of issues they wished to raise. The proposed black PVC windows - they would like to see if they could be changed to white to be more in keeping with the street scene. With the Juliette window removed it was still felt that the depth would impact on the adjoining neighbours. With those minor amendments the application could be moved forwards.

Councillor Chris Lloyd asked Officers if there had been any comments regarding this application aside from Batchworth Community Council.

The Planning Officer advised that there had been no comments.

Councillor Chris Lloyd also wanted to ask if Officers had any information regarding the colour of the windows.

The Planning Officer stated that no particular colour was stated on the application form, Condition 6 stated that prior to work commencing full details of proposed external materials should be submitted and approved in writing. Therefore Officers would need to make that judgement when submitted.

Councillor Debbie Morris wanted to ask about the soft landscaping. The applicant specified a certain type of planting that they had wanted to do. Under Condition 4 it proposed that a soft landscaping plan shall be submitted. It would be good if Officers had noted what the applicant proposed so that a reduced soft landscaping scheme wouldn't be accepted by Officers. However Councillor Morris would not have a problem with an enhanced soft landscaping scheme.

Councillor David Raw asked about the windows with leaded light windows proposed, and advised it was not a Conservation Area. If all houses were leaded light already do they need to be leaded or were Members happy to go with what is on the drawing.

The Planning Officer stated that Officers consider the proposed windows to be acceptable which was why it had been recommended to approve. The property was not in a Conservation Area, and generally replacement windows outside of a Conservation Area would not need planning permission. Condition 4 required a soft landscaping plan to be submitted and required a permeable paving to be set out as proposed by the applicant. Officers would have to make a judgement as what was reasonable as part of the condition.

Councillor Debbie Morris wanted to ensure Officers had noted what the applicant had said they would do and that would be accepted.

The Planning Officer responded that the planning permission would be based on the drawings as were shown on the screen. The site layout plan showed the proposals for soft landscaping, and this would be expected as an absolute minimum and must include the hedging along the front and side, the flowerbeds that were being proposed and the hedges along the left hand side of the garden.

Councillor Chris Lloyd stated that their points had been clarified and Officers were aware of Members views and therefore was happy to move the recommendation. Councillor Alex Hayward 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 Officer recommendation as set out in the report.

**PC 136/21      21/2628/FUL - Demolition of the existing garage and conservatory, erection of two storey front extension and front porch, part single, part two storey side and rear extensions, loft conversion including increase in ridge height served by front, side and rear rooflights and alterations to fenestration at 14 WESTBURY ROAD, NORTHWOOD, HA6 3BT**

The Planning Officer had no update.

Batchworth County Councillor Craig Coren spoke against the application. The Community Councillor stated that very few points had been accounted for in this revised application and if anything the application had increased in size. The property is being extended both the full width of the rear site and adjacent to the property on the corner of The Fairway. Where there was currently a single storey garage this was going to be replaced with a double height extension. The revised side elevation would dominate the street scene of The Fairway, if not Westbury Road. It would overlook No.44 The Fairway which faced into the site. The photograph showed it would have a complete changing effect on that corner site. The Velux windows to the front façade of the roof would be out of context with the location and were rarely found in Eastbury. The use of black PVC windows would also be out of context and the windows to the rear would be extensive. Due to the scale of the amendment to the roof it would be extensive, from quite a narrow roof to quite a wide roof. There would be a very large flat roof in the centre part which had been designed to keep the ridge height down. The Community Councillor felt that the development did not preserve or enhance the character or amenities of the local area and respect the distinct features of the surrounding area. They requested the development be refused or reduced in scale.

Councillor Debbie Morris agreed with much of Community Council views and also had a number of concerns. The Councillor asked that Members bear in mind that this was a corner plot, the house occupied a prominent site on Westbury Road and at the junction with The Fairway. Therefore comparisons with other developments along the road would not be appropriate. In the Officers report there was no reference to any other similar developments being in similar locations. This was a different type of development to others that may share some of its characteristics along Westbury Road. The single storey rear extension would be 6.7m in depth and would probably be more than half as much as the current depth. Appendix 2 of the Council's Development Management Policy stated that developments should not be disproportionate, and this would clearly be disproportionate. Officers had acknowledge that the

development and rear extension would be visible from the street scene. The increase in ridge height would be almost half a metre, and if that was a regular roof it may not be a problem but there is a crowned roof with roof lights peppered all over the front and rear, adding clutter to the roof. There was loss of soft landscape and there is minimal planting shown at the edge of the driveway and none at the boundary along the flank wall. While these points individually may not constitute grounds for refusal adding them all together and treating them together did create sufficient grounds for refusal on the basis of overdevelopment, impact on the street scene, scale, bulk and massing.

The Planning Officer did not wish to respond as the report set out the Officers case in terms of street scene and impact on neighbours etc.

Councillor Debbie Morris wished to move a proposal to refuse planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Stephen King.

Councillor Chris Lloyd asked if there had been any objections from the neighbours, the Planning Officer advised there had not been.

Councillor Debbie Morris advised this would have an adverse impact on the street scene due to bulk, massing and size of the development and in particular, the context of the prominence of being a corner plot.

On being put to the Committee a TIED vote was declared by the Vice Chair as the Chair the voting being 5 For, 5 against and 0 Abstentions. The Chair under Rule 23 used their casting vote and wished to vote against this proposal, therefore the motion was LOST 5 For, 6 Against (using casting vote) and 0 Abstentions.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved a proposal that Planning Permission be Granted seconded by Councillor Keith Martin.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chair as the Chair the voting being 5 For, 4 Against and 1 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendation as set out in the report.

**PC137/21**

**21/2772/FUL - Variation of Conditions 1 (Approved Plans), 2 (Landscaping (Permanent Access), 3 (Landscape Management Plan), 4 (Habitat Management Plan), 7 (SuDS Maintenance (On Site Works), 8 (SuDS Maintenance (Off Site Works), 9 (Boundary Treatments), 10 (Car Park Management Plan), 11 (Access), 12 (Travel Plan) and 14 (Delivery and Servicing Plan) of planning permission 21/1890/FUL to provide a permanent access from Uxbridge Road at THE REACH FREE SCHOOL, LONG LANE, MILL END, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 8AB**

The Planning Officer gave an update regarding an email sent by Ward Councillor Roger Seabourne which highlighted ongoing concerns regarding the proposal. A meeting had taken place earlier in the week with the agents and Officers.



Councillor Debbie Morris advised that there had already been comments to Officers at the February meeting. This related to a HSE recommendation that pupils on foot do not share the same entrance and exit. This was supposed to be followed up by Officers and should have appeared in the report but did not. The Councillor believed Officer's may have a verbal update to share.

The Planning Officer responded that the Councillors comments had been noted. With regards to concerns raised by Councillor Roger Seabourne this was in respect of health and safety advice which stemmed from a fatal accident in Bridgend in Wales, where a pupil was fatally struck by a school minibus. As part of the investigation it was found that the layby serving the school and their buses was not fit for purpose. The buses had to be parked on the opposite side of the school where there was no pavement so children were having to board in the middle of the road and with other vehicles travelling in opposite directions between waiting buses. It was noted that pedestrian safety was to be of the utmost importance as part of the scheme submitted and it had been considered as part of Herts County Council's (HCC's) role in the application as well as the audits that took place prior to getting the scheme to the planning stage. There was not a bus layby being proposed so it was not directly relevant but the concerns raised by Councillor Seabourne are appreciated. As part of the proposal some pavements have been widened and there had been no objection from HCC.

Councillor Sara Bedford asked if it would be possible to see what the changes were between the previous and proposed landscaping schemes.

The Planning Officer presented the plans to the Committee and showed Members the previous and proposed landscaping schemes. The Planning Officer asked if there were any concerns following the site visit.

Councillor Sara Bedford asked if any trees would be lost from the Highway although it appeared there would not be but there would be a lack of landscaping going into the school. Were there any trees which wouldn't now be planted on the school site, in particular along Long Lane where an awful lot were taken out which were not expected to be.

The Planning Officer responded that there would be no trees lost but there would be new trees planted.

Councillor Sara Bedford wanted to know if there were any trees due to be planted under the previous landscaping scheme that would now not be planted.

The Planning Officer replied that they were not aware of any.

Councillor Keith Martin had attended the site visit and was concerned regarding the A412 in the morning and afternoon, as it is known to get very busy and there would be cars that go out onto Long Lane and cars that turn right towards the A412. If one car was turning into the right hand lane going west, nobody would be able to move anywhere and there would be cars backing up. The Councillor mentioned that the school was growing, and it would become a far larger school. They also stated there would then cars idling in Long Lane and within the school which would not be good for local residents.

The Planning Officer stated there were seven schemes which were initially put forward and that this one was the preferred scheme. The application had been robustly considered using capacity modelling. When the school is at full capacity, with the provision of a new primary school, the new primary school were it to come forward then the whole highway impact would need to be assessed at that point. This scheme was the preferred approach and it had been considered robust by HCC. Members concerns were appreciated but the Council had gone with professional advice from HCC.

Councillor David Raw proposed to move the recommendation the Planning Permission be Granted as per the Officers recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Stephen King.

On being put to a vote by the Committee the motion was CARRIED by the Vice-Chair as the Chair with the voting being 7 For, 0 Against and 3 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendation as set out in the report.

**PC 138/21      21/2860/RSP: Part-retrospective: Ground and lower ground floor side and rear extension, loft conversion including insertion of rear dormer window, front rooflights, alterations to fenestration, rendering of property and extensions to softcast render, alterations to existing rear terrace, new external rear stairs to garden level and new raised planters at 23 COPTHORNE ROAD, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 4AB**

There was no update from Planning Officers.

Councillor Keith Martin wished to thank residents for allowing Members to visit the site.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved the recommendation that Planning Permission be Granted as per the Officer recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Sara Bedford.

On being put to a vote by the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chairs as the Chair with the voting being 8 For, 0 against and 2 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendation as set out in the report.

**PC 139/21      21/2901/FUL: Demolition of existing structure and construction of ground floor and lower ground floor rear extension with raised platform to rear at 181 ABBOTS ROAD, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WD5 0BN**

There was no update from Planning Officers

Councillor Debbie Morris moved the recommendation that Planning Permission is Granted as per Officer recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Keith Martin.

On being put to a vote by the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chair as the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED in accordance with the Officer Recommendation as set out in the officer report.

Chair