

---

**PLANNING COMMITTEE****MINUTES**

of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, on  
Thursday 23 January 2020 from 7.30pm – 9.02pm.

Councillors present:

Sarah Nelmes (Chairman)	Keith Martin (Vice Chairman)
Sara Bedford	Reena Ranger (for Cllr Michael Revan)
Alison Scarth (for Cllr Raj Khiroya)	Chris Lloyd
Steve Drury	Debbie Morris
Stephen Cox (for Cllr Stephen King)	Marilyn Butler

Also in attendance: District Councillors Joan King and Alison Wall, Croxley Green Parish Councillors Chris Mitchell and Andrew Gallagher, Watford Rural Parish Councillor Brigid Kelly, Chorleywood Parish Councillor Zenab Haji-Ismail.

Officers: Claire Westwood, Claire Wilson, Lauren Edwards, Angela Borges, Sarah Haythorpe and Jo Welton.

**PC 83/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Stephen King, Raj Khiroya, Michael Revan and Peter Getkahn with the named substitutes being Councillor Stephen Cox, Alison Scarth and Reena Ranger.

**PC 84/19 MINUTES**

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

**PC 85/19 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS**

None received.

**PC 86/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Sarah Nelmes 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 Councilor’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 view.”

Councillor Sara Bedford declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 12 as one of the Councillors who lives adjacent to the property and would leave the meeting during the consideration of this item.

**PC 87/19 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS AND CONFIRMATION OF THE THREE RIVERS (LAND ADJACENT JUNCTION 20 OF M25, WATFORD ROAD, HUNTON BRIDGE) TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2019, TPO 897**

The Landscape Officer had no update.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a speaker spoke against the making of the Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

Councillor Sara Bedford said anyone driving up the road saw the open space, the hill line with the trees on top and could not possibly draw the conclusion that the trees had no amenity value. To say this land was left over from the M25 made it sound like the M25 was some sort of ancient building. The land the M25 was built on was previously open land in the Gade Valley. If there is no problem with taking them out until and if a planning application was maybe granted then there was no problem in having TPOs. If a planning application was to be granted and agreed some of these trees could be removed and would take precedence over the TPO. Until and if we ever have planning permission granted she would like these trees to have some sort of status, to be recognised for their amenity value and be kept and not accidentally fall over. She moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen Cox, that the TPO be confirmed.

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

RESOLVED:

Option 1 to confirm the order without modification.

**PC 88/19 CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS AND CONFIRMATION OF THE THREE RIVERS (LAND ON THE WEST SIDE OF CHURCH HILL, ADJACENT TO NO.7, BEDMOND, ABBOTS LANGLEY) TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2019 – TPO 901**

The Landscape Officer had no update.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a speaker spoke in support of confirming the Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

Councillor Sara Bedford said that the trees were visible from the main road, the footpath which runs along the southern boundary of the site and the other footpath which runs to the north west. These trees provided amenity value and therefore moved the recommendation that the TPO be confirmed. .

Councillor Debbie Morris seconded the motion. The trees added great amenity value and looked magnificent. The fact that some of them were said to be at least 200 years old persuaded her to support the TPO.

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

RESOLVED:

Option 1, to confirm the Order with modification of G1 to one Hawthorn and one Elder.

PC 89/19

**19/2089/FUL - Demolition of existing cricket club and construction of two storey cricket pavilion including WCs and changing facilities, cafe and kitchen, gift shop, meeting and training space and other associated support/facility areas and viewing terrace at CHORLEYWOOD CRICKET CLUB, CHORLEYWOOD COMMON, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 5SL**

The Planning Officer advised that two further comments had been received to support the application which raised the same points previously summarised: It would improve the visual aspect of the common and would enable the Cricket Club to play a bigger role in the community.

Councillor Debbie Morris referred to Paragraph 7.2.10 in the report which said the floor space was in excess against the Cricket Board Standards but did this include the shared space of the Cricket Club or just the Cricket Club space. The Planning Officer said that the Cricket Club requirements are for the parts which had been annotated as being for the Cricket Club so would not include the café itself but would include the shared spaces which are shared between the two. This did comply with their requirements.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes said there were objections on the lighting. She was concerned that it was an area with a lot of wildlife and there might be some issues with out of hours lighting. The Planning Officer said that could be dealt with by way of a condition before pre commencement to the development and in consultation with Hertfordshire Ecology.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked for clarification on the proposed hours of use of the cafe. The Planning Officer said the agent had provided details and the Café would be open 7 days a week, and would have different winter and summer opening hours. The opening hours would be 7am to 5pm between October to March and 8.30am to 5pm April to September.

Councillor Debbie Morris said in the winter it would mean that if the café was open that long it would necessitate additional lighting as it would be dark at 7am in the morning and at 5pm in the evening. Members would want to ensure minimal light pollution in the Conservation Area and Green Belt. She would be happy with reduced opening hours in the winter to align with daylight hours but would be happy for longer opening hours in the summer to align with summertime daylight hours. The Planning Officer said that if Members were minded to approve the application subject to conditions, conditions can be looked at and circulated with regards to the hours.

Councillor Reena Ranger understood the sensitivity of the site and noted the Conservation Officer's comments. The building was not fit for purpose and Sports England's comments said it was inadequate in terms of supply, quality, facility and meeting current needs. Although there was no official exemptions to the Green Belt there should be some weight given to special circumstance that this would be a community asset. With some clubs facing decline the Cricket Club should be able to accommodate future membership and be seen as an opportunity. The existing building was in a state of disrepair but the new facilities would provide work training and future employment which were all positives that should be given weight in order to try to mitigate the concerns. What impact would the building have on the Church and how much weight should be given. The Planning Officer said there were two aspects when looking at the level of harm, the first being the level of harm to the adjacent Listed Building in the Conservation Area and then separately the Green Belt. The Conservation Officer had considered that there would be less than substantial harm by virtue of the size of the building in this part of the Conservation Area. Also to consider was the impact the use of the building would have. In the Officers view it

would result in less than substantial harm on the heritage assets. However it is considered there are public benefits to outweigh this.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes said whilst she could see there was a community benefit with the special education element, she was concerned that if that failed the café could become a branch of Costa six months later and that would definitely bring harm to the Green Belt .

Councillor Reena Ranger noted the Officer points on the less than substantial harm but asked if there was some way, in terms of licensing or conditioning which we could put in place to ensure that Costa type facility did not occur.

Councillor Marilyn Butler said the Church across the Green had a very modern extension, which fitted in very well and did not seem to impact on the Conservation Area.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes said she had never seen the Parish Council, the Commoners, the Church and the Residents Association all agreed. The Committee needed to make sure that only planning issues were considered which was why Officers had provided the recommendation they had.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a speaker spoke in support of application but clarified that the hours of opening were starting at 9am opening

Councillor Sarah Nelmes clarified that the previous agreed application was for a single storey extension with no café and this application was significantly different. Officers concerns were to do with the café and its appropriateness and not about the sports facility.

Councillor Alison Wall supported the application. The existing pavilion was in a very poor state of repair and not fit for purpose. The new building would be sited broadly on the existing footprint and would pose no harm to neighbouring residents with no detrimental or physical impact to the adjacent wildlife site. The parking area would remain as an unmarked car park accommodating about 20 cars. Having a two storey building would reduce the floor area required and the design was in keeping with the church and primary school on the other side of The Green. Mission Employable were supportive of the Local Strategic Partnership Strategy and were working in partnership with the Cricket Club. No protected trees would be removed. Members should see the application as a valued community asset addressing public health priorities. She disagreed with the Conservation Officer that the building would be overbearing and dominant. Issues in the report regarding external lighting, opening times and making sure that the tree roots were not damaged should be addressed.

Chorleywood Parish Council supported the application. They emphasised each application should be determined on its own merits against the development plan. Paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that the provision of outdoor sports and outdoor recreation were appropriate within the Green Belt. In planning terms there was no clear threshold for when a use stops being ancillary, it is based on a matter of fact and degree. The report focused on the floorspace area but little weight was given to the very special circumstances, which was fundamental in establishing that the café would only ever be used as ancillary to the main use. The Parish Council owned the freehold over the Common with the Cricket Club leasing the space directly from them. A legal obligation to the lease would be imposed on the Cricket Club that the premises may only be used as an ancillary café for as long as Mission Employable delivered the service. They would have no right to sublet the Pavilion without prior approval from the Parish Council. There would be no separate lease from the café and no rights for them to be a stand-alone operator. They wished to emphasise there were very special circumstances in line with the policy set

out in Paragraph 144 of the NPPF that outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The Planning Officer said they had sought legal advice from the Planning Solicitor in respect of the attachment of a personal permission. The view was that it would not comply with the tests set out in the NPPF therefore would not be appropriate to attach. In the case of new buildings the attachment for personal permission should only be with very special circumstances and in this case it would not be appropriate. The floor space is integral to the building and should Mission Employable use cease you would be left with a nil use.

Councillor Sara Bedford said everyone supported the proposed use of this building. The problem was that the Planning Permission runs with the land and not the owner or the user. The Parish Council could not bind any future Parish Council. It would not be impossible for a future Parish Council to decide that an offer of a large amount of money to put and name your own coffee shop and lease the building could not happen. Planning Permission to have an A3 use in that building would stand and could be taken up by any commercial user and that is clearly not what anyone wants. A number of options had been looked at including having a personal permission to the charity but we cannot do that legally. There may be a way forward to grant D2 use (community use) to be checked by the Council's Planning Solicitors for their legal opinion. That way if any commercial operator wanted to run the café they would need to come back for a change of use. She proposed that the application be deferred to allow for discussions with the Council's Planning Solicitor with regard to the D2 community use. The only reason she could see this not being acceptable to the applicant was that they may in the future want to use the premises commercially but had said that was not the case. This could enable the application to be granted which was what everyone wanted and provide the Cricket Club with a better facility.

The Planning Officer noted the proposal to defer the application. From an Officers point of view they wanted to make clear the matter of the Conservation Area and impact on Heritage assets. There are considered to be public benefits to outweigh that harm in Officers view. With regards to the impact on the Green Belt, the Planning Officers report sets out that the development is inappropriate and that there is additional harm to openness. Officers did not consider that Very Special Circumstances had been demonstrated, however, they noted that during the discussion Members had indicated that they considered that Very Special Circumstances may exist. This was essentially to ensure it is for the charity use only and not a commercial venture.

Councillor Sara Bedford said it must be purely a charitable and community function which supports sporting endeavours in the community. Members would be prepared to say that there are very special circumstances for that use only. We are not setting a precedence and not allowing commercial use on this site for the future.

Councillor Debbie Morris said there were very special circumstance by reason of the proposed use by the café, the increased cricketing opportunities to other sections of the population, the toilet facilities for dog walkers', a meeting point and the huge amount of other benefits. We must ensure that there is no commercial advantage gained which we would not support and supported the motion put forward.

Councillor Chris Lloyd asked if the lighting could be looked at and when it would be required for the cricket to actually function.

The Planning Officer noted the comments made. Officer's would go away and have a discussion on what Members were trying to achieve. The Officer recommendation may not be different when the application was returned to the Committee but they appreciated what Members were expressing with regard to very special circumstances.

Councillor Reena Ranger asked if they could be mindful of after school activities for children and if there could be some relaxation in regards to the lighting issue.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared for referral by the Chairman the voting being unanimous

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED to allow for discussions regarding the D2 community use.

**PC 90/19 19/2133/FUL - Demolition of existing buildings and provision of 345 residential units (Use Class C3) in 2 buildings ranging from 3-7 storeys including a 1 and 2 storey podium; 621sqm of flexible commercial floor space (Use Class A1-A5, B1, D1/D2); 1,754sqm retail floorspace (Use Class A1) podium and surface level car and cycle parking; landscaping; and associated works at LAND AT SOUTH OXHEY, SOUTH OXHEY CENTRAL, HERTFORDSHIRE**

The Planning Officer reported that comments from HCC Property Services had been received regarding financial contributions sought which were set out in Paragraph 4.1.12 of the report. However, those initial comments did not include details of contributions sought towards primary and secondary education. Officers now had those further comments from Hertfordshire County Council advising that contributions of £104,332 and £74,523 would be sought for primary and secondary education respectively.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes reminded Members that no decision was being made regarding this application but if there was anything Members wanted to be considered or looked at it could be considered when the application came back to the Committee to be determined.

Local Ward Councillor Joan King invited Members to visit South Oxhey during the working day to see how bad the parking and traffic was. There was no adequate parking for the buildings already built. She would like to see 45% social housing which was promised but all they were going to get was 19%. Can some of the homes that are to be built be four bedroom social housing for families? The infrastructure needs to be looked at as South Oxhey is getting no infrastructure to accommodate all the extra people. What South Oxhey needs most urgently is a medical centre and should be part of this application. Could the Council speak to the County Council as the current Doctors are unable to cope? She asked that the application not be passed just because the first part had been approved but consider the people being affected.

Parish Councillor Brigid Kelly spoke on behalf of local residents. The application was treating South Oxhey as an urban area but it was not and she believed the urban building regulations should not be applied. There were concerns about the additional pressures of the new build and the impact of the increased population on the inadequate infrastructure and medical resources. In the original application it promised a hub to accommodate medical services but this was no longer referenced in the plans. There is huge pressure on the schools which were oversubscribed with local children going to school outside the Parish. A daylight impact assessment report was commissioned by the Parish Council and showed that daylight would be badly restricted in some of the surrounding flats and houses. One flat would completely lose any daylight in the living room making it gloomy and requiring permanent electric lighting. There was no mention in the plans about how the existing murals celebrating the 50th anniversary of South Oxhey would be preserved and re-sited. Complaints from residents had been received regarding loss of broadband and TV signals since construction of the six storey unit. The completed flats in phase 1 and 2 were not accessible for wheelchair users as demonstrated when a wheelchair user was unable to open the fire doors in the entrance hallway and could barely fit in the lift. They were in a small manual wheelchair so it's questionable if a bigger electric wheelchair or

large buggy would fit in the lift. The Council should engage with the Equality Commission to review the disabled access before making any decisions. Members were reminded that South Oxhey residents had been living and shopping in a building site for the last few years.

The Planning Officer said these points would be picked up when a report was returned for determination. On parking, it was noted that this is an area of concern so Officers would make sure this was addressed. On the affordable housing there was some information in the existing report. Essentially when the original Hybrid planning permission was granted, permission was granted for 514 dwellings of which 96 were affordable which was 19% at that time and was based on the viability evidence demonstrated. Phase 3 would have included 200 private dwellings but this current application uplifts this to include 345 with the affordable housing calculated on the uplift to 145 dwellings, overall 45% of the uplift would be provided as affordable housing which was equivalent to 65 units. There would be more detail in the report when it was returned to Members. With regards to the daylight/sunlight the Officer was aware that Watford Rural Parish Council had commissioned a report by BRE which came to different conclusions regarding the impact of the development. This was something that was being reviewed in more detail. With regard to accessibility all the units were designed to meet or exceed nationally described space standards and all the flats met Building Regulations M42 which was essentially equivalent to life time homes. The six ground floor units would be wheelchair adaptable. Those and the other points raised would all be addressed in more detail in due course.

Councillor Stephen Cox said this was an enlargement of somewhere near to 75%. In terms of the affordable housing of the 345 homes, the developer gets 280 to sell and the community gets 65 which was slightly down on what the community were told in July, so all that would be provided for affordable housing was just under 19% in reality. We would not get 70% of social rent but would just get over half (33%). He understood the need to make a profit, but South Oxhey desperately needs affordable homes. He had read the Parish Councils concerns, but it must be remembered that the 96 houses quoted replace the 96 that were already there. On the Highways objection it did stack up and there was a lot of work to be done on the highways. At the public exhibition there had been concerns about the mini roundabout and the capacity it had at the junction of Oxhey Drive and Prestwick Road. He had copies of the BRE daylight report which he would give out. The pressures of parking were a huge problem and we may have to look at retaining the temporary car park at Henbury Way. There is a parking deficit identified in the report, therefore there is more to be done.

Councillor Chris Lloyd noted there had been an objection on flooding and wanted to know that those comments would be fully addressed although the report had explained how the objections could be overcome. On cycling he noted there was insufficient places for cyclists to use as well as insufficient parking. He also asked about the possibilities of having four bedroom properties.

The Planning Officer said there was a current objection from Affinity Water and the applicant had provided additional information in order to try and address that point which had been forwarded to Affinity Water earlier this month and the Council were expecting a response from them shortly which should hopefully address that issue. The report would then be updated. There was also an objection from the Lead Local Flood Authority, the applicant and consultants were currently preparing revised drainage details in order to try and address those matters. Those and the Highway objections were all aspects which would all need to be addressed before the application was returned for determination.

Councillor Sara Bedford said the subject of contributions to provide infrastructure facilities for Health and Education are for large planning applications a source of irritation and anger from this Committee, as to whether they are sufficient for purpose.

The point we have to go by was that the Health Authority and the Education Authority had looked at this and said what they want. She shared the fury of the Parish Council regarding the money so far being sent to Rickmansworth schools. When they built almost a 1,000 houses in Leavesden they did exactly the same with the money with the local children having to go to school in Hemel Hempstead as there are not enough school places locally. She visited South Oxhey town centre at least once a week and invariably parked in the same place, Henbury Way car park. She had never failed to get a parking space and not seen the car park more than half full. She realised when more people were living there, the shops and market were open more parking would be used. When driving through the centre of South Oxhey she had not seen a parking problem or any dangerous parking at the junctions in that part of South Oxhey it was more so within the residential areas. She felt the parking needed to be monitored before the Council to review it and not before the redevelopment was completed.

The Planning Officer said in reference to Henbury Way car park the planning history of this report set out that there was also currently an application submitted for the retention of the temporary car park at Henbury Way. The intention was that although they were separate applications they are related and that they would come back to Committee at the same time.

Councillor Keith Martin asked what the difference was in the number of affordable homes before the development started (Phase 1) and when it was completed assuming that the 345 go ahead. The Planning Officer said she would update the report when it came back to the Committee for determination.

Councillor Reena Ranger wanted to know what can be done to provide more greenery and trees. The parking showed a shortfall of 400 spaces if you added up all the developments. She appreciated that the Committee were looking at having a reduction in vehicles but this was not central London where you can commute quite easily by bus or by train. If you want to commute in Three Rivers this is a mission in itself and with an aging population you may or may not need a car to get around. She saw cars having an electric revolution which would need charging points. Not addressing the parking was inviting antisocial parking and essentially what we were saying was that the residents here would be commuters and this was not something we should be promoting for our high streets and local communities.

The Planning Officer commented that the podium landscaping was a new concept in terms of planning applications and showed a drawing to Members which demonstrated how it would look. Essentially they were providing parking at surface level in court yards to the rear of buildings. It was not necessarily attractive to look at parking so they would have a landscaped podium above so the parking was not at basement level but at ground level. The communal landscaped podium area would be accessible from the flats. In total there would be four podiums with each block having two podiums of communal landscaped areas which would be above the parking. In addition the units which open onto them would have a small defined terrace area at the edge of the podium with the central space communal.

Councillor Debbie Morris said the application showed no basement parking. For a development of this size and in view of the parking pressures, there should be. Did Officers know what the air quality would be like for the podiums as they would be above the parking? Could this be investigated? She was concerned that Herts Highways were using 2016 figures in calculating the trip rates. 2016 was probably before a number of the new flats were developed so this was out of date and should not be relied on. They were predicting only 21 additional outbound journeys and 7 inbound in the morning peak and the reverse in the afternoon peak. With this amount of development she would be astonished that the trip rates were so low and asked that these figures be reviewed. There were references to no dropped kerbs at the junctions so wheelchairs and buggies would struggle to cross the roads and

suggested this be reviewed. There was also a comment about balconies that Hertfordshire County Council would not adopt the highways beneath them and would need some kind of maintenance plan. The gates needed to be relocated to ensure that vehicles did not block the highway. There were no electric charging points in the parking bays and this should be addressed. With potentially another 1,000 people moving in how would the surgeries cope? Can we ensure there was community health care provision additional to what is there? With regard to the light/sunlight, daylight and vertical sky components there was not much detail and hoped that more information would be provided specifically on the average daylight factor. 88% of properties were said to be compliant but how about the remaining 12% are they just below or are they significantly below. Were there going to be properties with no natural daylight. On the sunlight hours was 21% an acceptable level and was this the living room or bedrooms. On amenity space she knew it was within an urban area but we have only a third of the requisite provision which was unfortunate and on commercial parking spaces there was a shortfall of 26 justified as a zonal reduction applies. Perhaps we should not be using zonal reductions here and ensure that a full provision is provided.

Councillor Steve Drury asked about the podiums and whether they would be open to the general public or purely for the people living in the flats. The Planning Officer said they would be for the people living in the flats.

Councillor Alison Scarth said the comments to provide more contributions for the NHS needed to be pressed for as there were not enough Doctors surgeries in the area and there was a need for more community health facilities. On the parking there were problems with parking on the grass verges and we need some contribution towards the parking facilities. A better bus service was also needed.

Councillor Reena Ranger was not clear on the use of the podiums. With regard to the surrounding areas from the pictures where the pharmacy was if that was a tree lined area it would make more of a difference to the immediate area. The Planning Officer said that there were landscaping proposals for the enhancement of the public realm but with regard to the communal spaces we can ensure that more information is provided to members in the report.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said the report stated that 658 people were consulted but no one had replied or had that figure changed from when the report was written. If we are looking for more parking spaces could we have a basement? The Planning Officer said that the parking comments had been noted and would be taken on board. With regard to the neighbour comments there was no change and no responses had been received although it was understood people may have gone directly to the Parish Council with their comments but no objections had been received to Planning.

#### RESOLVED:

Members noted that there was no recommendation for approval or refusal at this stage in the consideration of the application.

Noted the report, and made the above general comments with regards to the material planning issues raised by the application.

Councillor Sara Bedford left the meeting.

**PC 91/19 19/2326/RSP - Part Retrospective: Change of Use: Laying of driveway to side and front of property and alterations to landscaping at 74 WINDMILL DRIVE, CROXLEY GREEN, WD3 3FE**

The Planning Officer reported that this was a retrospective application and showed how the property looked presently. However the applicant was seeking to make

amendments under the application which would include changing the area immediately to the front of the dwelling back to soft landscaping with additional planting along the side and with the planting of a Rowanberry Tree. Along to the south of the dwelling adjacent to the other highway a further strip of soft landscaping measuring approximately 2 metres by about 9.5 metres in length would also be provided. As Members what was there now was not proposed to stay and had made changes to introduce further soft landscaping.

Councillor Reena Ranger asked if the tree in the picture but had been removed. Would the new turf back up to where this tree was, would a new mature tree be put back and would the turf be in line with the tree that had now been removed? The Planning Officer clarified that the tree in the picture had been removed as it was granted permission under a separate TPO application back in 2017. Under the current application they were planning to plant a new tree which the Landscape Officer had raised no objection to and was acceptable. The trees at the rear of the site along the amenity verge it was Officers understanding they were all staying and would not be affected by the proposed development.

The Planning Officer said the hard standing where the car was located was not proposed to be removed and would not be taken nearer to the trees. The applicant was proposing was essentially to the right hand side of the car in the picture to introduce a landscape buffer along the side with the road and the area to the left of the front door where there is a different paving that was proposed to be fully soft landscaping with flower beds along the left and where the tree is proposed to be planted.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes summarised that they had a little piece of drive in the middle but they then put in a lot of drive to both sides and they were now planning to make it a bit less drive to one side and all grass back to the otherside.

Councillor Stephen Cox said it would be fair to say that the position of the tree had moved to the left but wondered if it should be positioned nearer to where it was and was it not likely it could drop on the neighbour more than the previous one.

Croxley Green Parish Council thanked officers for producing a thorough report. The area on the right was of particular concern. Although it was owned by the resident it was not in the curtilage of the building. It was meant to be for open space which was part of the design of this estate. They supported the delegation of the application to the Head of Regulatory Services with the following caveats to check to see if there had been any changes since the last visit as they understood there might and secondly if the Committee were minded to grant the application they consider including a condition requiring the side areas to be fully restored to grass and trees on the sale of the property or if circumstances no longer required the hard standing.

The Planning Officer noted that the application was acceptable regardless of the personal circumstances of the applicant and therefore the conditions suggested by the Parish were not considered to be reasonable.

Councillor Steve Drury said one picture showed that the tree at the back, where the new paved area was now looked like it had died whereas the tree behind it and the one to the left of the second house were in full leaf. Could Officers advise the status of the tree? Councillor Sarah Nelmes said in her view this was a perfectly reasonable application to slightly increase the size of their parking admittedly their first attempt at it was excessive but this amended application was acceptable.

Councillor Debbie Morris proposed that Part Retrospective Planning Permission be Granted and has effect from the date on which the development was started and is subject to the conditions as set out in the Officer report seconded by Councillor Sarah Nelmes.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said if the tree had died due to the work done could a condition be included that the tree be replanted. The Planning Officer pointed out the Landscape Officer comments in the report stated that due to the nature of the work they did not consider that any adjacent trees were damaged.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chairman the voting being 7 For, 0 Against and 2 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That PART RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED and has effect from the date on which the development was started and is subject to the conditions as set out in the Officer report.

**PC 92/19 19/2354/FUL: Installation of an outdoor gym area at HORNHILL ROAD RECREATION GROUND, CHALFONT ROAD, MAPLE CROSS, HERTFORDSHIRE**

The Planning Officer reported that Herts Highways had now commented and raised no objection subject to a condition requiring the submission of a construction management plan which was already attached under Condition C3 of the application.

Councillor Debbie Morris said that the plans showed there would be a small tarmac base around each piece of equipment with grass inbetween. Would the grass be capable of being maintained? The Planning Officer said the leisure colleagues who had made the application had been in consultation with colleagues in the Council who would be responsible for maintenance and did not consider this would present any problems.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved, seconded by Councillor Steve Drury, that Planning Permission be Granted subject to conditions.

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

RESOLVED:

That subject to no new material considerations being raised, PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the conditions set out in the Officer report.

**PC 93/19 19/2355/FUL – Two storey side and rear extension, internal alterations and alterations to fenestration at 10 THE CLOISTERS, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 1HL**

The Planning Officer reported a correction under the neighbour consultation section with the summary of responses zero which was correct but in line with the above point it should read that there had been no responses from neighbours. 14 neighbours were notified but no comments received in relation to the application.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes said what was proposed would make it better and would match the property next to it. The Planning Officer said essentially the next door property had already had this side extension with the ridge line of the original dwelling followed. At the moment it was currently set down on this property but would essentially rebalance between the properties and therefore Officers had no objection.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved, seconded by Councillor Marilyn Butler, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and no new material considerations being raised

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

RESOLVED:

That subject to no new material considerations being raised, PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the conditions set out in the officer report.

**PC 94/19 19/2377/FUL – Demolish detached garage and store, double storey side extension at 102 KINDERSLEY WAY, ABBOTS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD5 0DQ**

The Planning Officer had no update.

Councillor Steve Drury noticed the difference in the height of the land. When the extension was built what finish would it be render or brick. The Planning Officers said the houses in the other photographs showed there were some other similar extensions in the street scene. This property was brick and the materials would be conditioned to match.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said there was quite a hill in the road. The Planning Officer said there was a significant step in land levels with the properties on that side of Kindersley Way but the extension would be set in 1.2 metres from the boundary so would have a step side elevation to follow the splay boundary which Officers considered acceptable.

Councillor Debbie Morris saw there were no neighbour or Parish objections and moved that Planning Permission be Granted subject to conditions, seconded by Councillor Sarah Nelmes.

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

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTD subject to the conditions set out in the Officer report.

**CHAIRMAN**