
PLANNING COMMITTEE**MINUTES**

of the Planning Committee meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, on 14 February 2019 from 7.30pm to 8.04pm.

Councillors present:

Chris Lloyd (Vice-Chairman in the Chair)
Nelmes)
Marilyn Butler)
Diana Barber)
David Major
Peter Getkahn

Alison Scarth (substitute for Sarah
Rupert Barnes (substitute for
Valerie Coltman (substitute for
Steve Drury
Debbie Morris
Reena Ranger

Also in attendance: Abbots Langley Parish Councillor Jean Bowman and Chorleywood Parish Councillor Jackie Worrall.

Officers: Claire Westwood, Suzanne O'Brien, Freya Clewley and Sarah Haythorpe.

COUNCILLOR CHRIS LLOYD IN THE CHAIR**PC 143/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sarah Nelmes, Diana Barber and Marilyn Butler with the named substitutes being Councillors Alison Scarth, Rupert Barnes and Valerie Coltman.

PC 144/18 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 17 January 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PC 145/18 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

None.

PC 146/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Major declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 10 and 11 as a Member of the Abbots Langley Parish Council Planning Committee but would be entitled to stay and vote as he:

- has an open mind about the application;
- is not bound by the views of the Parish Planning Committee; and
- can deal with the application fairly and on its merits at Committee.

Councillor Alison Scarth declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6 (18/2354/RSP - Part Retrospective: Single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and loft conversion including provision of rear dormer window at 8 PUTTENHAM CLOSE, SOUTH OXHEY, WD19 7BJ) as she had spoken

to one of the neighbours of the application site and would leave the meeting during the consideration of this application.

Councillor Chris Lloyd read out the following statement 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 Councillors. 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 a view.”

PC 147/18 18/2214/FUL – Two storey front, side and rear extensions, front porch and alterations to fenestration, site frontage to provide additional parking and external materials at 7 BRUSHWOOD DRIVE, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 5RS

The Planning Officer had no update.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) Mr Kates spoke against the application.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said Members had been on a site visit and had looked at the application from both the adjoining properties No.5 and No.9 as well as the actual property.

Councillor Steve Drury asked about the side windows and potential overlooking. If permission was granted could the windows be frosted and have minimal opening. The Planning Officer referred to Condition C5 which required obscure glazing to the first floor level flank windows and also the rear most ground floor south western flank window. They would only have a top level opening of a height of 1.7m above floor level (fan light opening).

Councillor Sara Bedford said following the site visit she could not see a problem with the application.

Chorleywood Parish Council said the main difficulty with this development was the steepness of the site as shown in the photographs. Anything going up the hill from No.7 Brushwood Drive would have an overbearing impact. The topography of the area must be taken into account. To the neighbours it would appear as a two storey extension. Although they had their roofs indented there would still be an adverse impact. She supported what the residents had said.

The Planning Officers said the application to begin with was deeper than what was now being considered. The ground floor had been reduced because it would have significantly intruded the 45 degree splay line, which was considered because of the land levels. Now it had been reduced the intrusion was very minor and therefore the Officer recommendation was to approve the application.

Councillor Chris Lloyd clarified that the original plans the Parish Council would have seen would showed the extension coming back further but this had now been reduced which was why Officers were recommending approval as there would be lesser impact. The Planning Officer clarified that it was not that it was a lesser impact, but that it was considered an acceptable impact on the

neighbour.

Councillor Peter Getkahn moved, seconded by Councillor Debbie Morris, that the application be granted. He said it was unfortunate with regard to the land levels but the Committee did consider every application with due diligence.

Councillor Reena Ranger sought clarification with regard to the footprint of the proposed extension. The Committee had used the tree as the proposed marker as to where the extension line would be. Was the tree to be retained? The Planning Officer confirmed that the tree was to be retained and Councillor Ranger was correct in her assumption.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chairman in the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Officers report.

PC 148/18 18/2354/RSP - Part Retrospective: Single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and loft conversion including provision of rear dormer window at 8 PUTTENHAM CLOSE, SOUTH OXHEY, WD19 7BJ.

The Planning Officer had no update.

Councillor Reena Ranger sought clarification on what was allowed under permitted development and what had been granted under the previous planning permissions. The Planning Officer advised that the two storey side and single storey rear extensions had received full planning permission. However, the single storey rear extension was 3.6 metres in depth whereas prior approval for the single storey rear extension was submitted for 4 metres in depth which had been granted. There was a certificate for the loft conversion and dormer and front roof lights. Basically these permissions had all been constructed as a single operation and not constructed independently of each other hence why a retrospective application to consolidate the three had now been submitted.

The speaker declined to speak.

Councillor David Major asked about the first floor extension which showed a dimension of one metre to the boundary whereas the Council's guideline would normally be 1.2 metres. Did Officers accept this? The Planning Officer advised that the principal of one metre was granted under the previous permission and it was considered that due to the density of the area one metre would be appropriate and would not result in a terracing effect or cramped feature.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked if the loft conversion counted as a bedroom therefore required an additional parking space. The Planning Officer said that the scheme as a whole resulted in four bedrooms and to meet the parking requirements it would be expected to provide three parking spaces. Officers were including the loft conversion as a bedroom. To clarify the front boundary wall would be removed to allow for two car parking spaces to be provided at the front of the property.

Councillor Debbie Morris said she was happy with the application and moved the recommendation that part retrospective planning permission be granted,

seconded by Councillor Stephen King.

Councillor Reena Ranger said reading the report there had been some concerns that the property would be used as a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) but there was not condition on this. Should the Committee be minded to approve the application could this be added? The Planning Officer said it was not a large house and they did not think it would be reasonable to add a condition. Up to a certain size it could be done under permitted development depending on the number of residents within the HMO and she did not think it would be a reasonable condition to impose.

Councillor Sara Bedford agreed with the Officer comments. There were many houses with four bedrooms in the District and they would not want a condition imposed and it would be unreasonable to do this.

Councillor Steve Drury commented on why there were several permissions given and the Committee were now having to agree this one retrospectively. Surely the applicant knew what they were going to do when they started. Councillor Chris Lloyd said this was not a planning matter but the comment was noted.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chairman in the Chair the voting being 10 For, 0 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That PART RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

PC 149/18 18/2413/FUL – Demolition of existing detached bungalow and erection of a replacement detached bungalow including accommodation in the roofspace served by rear dormer window and front rooflights and provision of a single storey detached garage at 72 EASTWICK CRESCENT, MILL END, WD3 8YJ

The Planning Officer had no update.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen King that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

On being put to the Committee the Motion was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chairman in the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Officer recommendation.

PC 150/18 18/2431/FUL – Single storey side and rear extension and front porch canopy, two storey rear extension and first floor side extension with alterations to frontage at 12 BRUSHWOOD DRIVE, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 5RT

The Planning Officer reported that this application was a resubmission of the previously approved application number 18/1514/FUL. The differences to the previously approved application included an increase in depth to the rear and a first floor front side extension. Amended plans were sought during the course of the application to reduce the depth of the rear extension in line with the

previously approved application. This application was for an additional first floor front side extension and additional parking space.

Chorleywood Parish Council said that based on the reduction described which had been done since the Parish Council saw the application this now took into consideration what the Parish Council were objecting to. The reduction overcame the Parish concerns.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved, seconded by Councillor Steve Drury that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

On being put to the Committee the motion to was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chairman in the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be Granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Officer recommendation.

PC 151/18 18/2523/FUL – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling with accommodation within the roof served by front and rear dormers at 17 ALVA WAY, CARPENDERS PARK, WD19 5EE

The Planning Officer reported that since the Officer report was published there had been a separate application submitted for an 8 metre deep prior approval extension. This did not change anything in respect of this application and if both applications were approved only one could be implemented not both.

Councillor Peter Getkahn asked for clarification on which application the Committee would be voting on and whether there would be another application later. The Planning Officer stated that the prior approval application would not be coming to the Committee as it was being processed through the permitted development process. The process required us to notify the neighbours for a period of 21 days and if they made comments then we would then assess the impact on their amenity. It was still being processed and Officers did not know what the outcome would be.

Councillor Sara Bedford asked for clarification on the plan and what the difference was between this permission and implementing the 8 metre permission in terms of the overall depth. The Planning Officer advised that essentially when the first application was submitted it was for a deeper rear extension than what was now proposed. After the site visit it was considered it would result in quite a significant impact to the adjoining boundaries. They had submitted the prior approval for a larger rear should they not want to implement this permission.

Councillor Sara Bedford asked for clarification on what was the differences with the depth. The Planning Officer said that because this was for the demolition and rebuild it was difficult to be specific but approximately it was 4 metres currently so it would be an additional 4 metres.

Councillor Peter Getkahn asked about the provision for car parking at the back as it was unlikely a car could be park in the garage. The Planning Officer said a third parking space had been shown in the existing garage but in the report it stated that it was unlikely that a car could maneuver into the garage. The worst case scenario was that two car parking spaces could be provided on the site rather than three. Officers did not think it would be possible to maneuver a car into the garage and that was what the recommendation was based on.

Councillor Reena Ranger clarified that the applicant would be able to go 4 metres further on the prior approval. This was confirmed by the Officers. This was generally a sympathetic scheme in the area and she proposed that planning permission be granted, seconded by Councillor Valerie Coltman.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chairman in the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendation in the report.

PC 152/18 19/0021/FUL - Ground floor side extension to No. 57 and the internal reconfiguration to both No. 57 and No. 61 to facilitate the creation of a single retail unit at 57 & 61 HIGH STREET, BEDMOND, WD5 0QP.

There was no update.

Councillor Sara Bedford said the unit had been operating as one unit for some time. When the shops were rebuilt and redeveloped some 23 years ago it was built as two shops to try and provide some competition with each shop not allowed to sell the same things. This soon became impossible to enforce and effectively the shop now operated as one but with a wall down the middle. She moved that the application be approved, seconded by Councillor David Major.

On being put to the Committee the recommendation was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chairman in the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in accordance with the Officer recommendation in the report.

PC153/18 19/0059/FUL – District Council Application: Refurbishment of existing play area including the construction of new play equipment at PLAY AREA, LEAVESDEN COUNTRY PARK, COLLEGE ROAD, ABBOTS LANGLEY

The Planning Officer reported that comments had been received from the Parish Council who raised no objections to the proposal.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said he had previously visited the site and was quite happy with the application.

Councillor Sara Bedford was very happy with the application which was the replacement of the old play area on the same site. This was a good location, close to buildings and on the main path through the site. She moved the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Reena Ranger.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Vice-Chairman in the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the Conditions and Informatives set in the officer recommendation.

CHAIRMAN