
PLANNING COMMITTEE**MINUTES**

For a virtual/remote meeting held on Thursday 21 May 2020 at 7.30pm

Councillors present:

Sarah Nelmes (Chairman)
Sara Bedford
Marilyn Butler
Steve Drury
Raj Khuroya
Michael Revan

Keith Martin (Vice Chairman)
Peter Getkahn
Chris Lloyd
Stephen King
Debbie Morris

Also in attendance: Chorleywood Parish Council Councillor Zenab Haji-Ismael, Councillor Paula Hiscocks

Officers: Claire Westwood, Adam Ralton, Matthew Roberts, Sarah Haythorpe, Sherrie Ralton

PC 117/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None received.

PC 118/19 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 19 March 2020 were confirmed as a correct record subject to a post meeting note being added under Minute PC113/19 to read as follows and were signed by the Chair.

Post meeting note:

“Following further correspondence between Councillor Cox and Planning Officers it has been clarified that the number of houses using the single access from Heysham Drive onto Prestwick Road would in fact number 294 and not 311 as he stated at the meeting, were the 53 homes granted formal planning permission. Councillor Cox wishes to apologise for inadvertently advising the Committee of the incorrect figure.”

PC 119/19 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

None received.

PC 120/19 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 Peter Getkahn declared a pecuniary interest in item number 6 as a consultee for the application (20/0098/FUL - Demolition of existing garage and associated buildings and structures and the erection of a 75-bed care home (use class C2) with car parking and associated landscaping at BRIDGE MOTORS, 44 CHURCH STREET, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 1JE) and left the meeting when this item was discussed.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes declared a non registrable interest in item number 7, (20/0258/RSP - Part-retrospective: Single-storey rear extension, first floor rear extension, raised terraces to the rear, part-loft conversion including front dormer windows and insertion of rooflights at 46 CLEMENTS ROAD, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 5JT) and left the meeting when this item was discussed as the applicant was a friend.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group declared non-pecuniary interests in items 9, 10 and 12, 20/0556/OUT - Outline application: Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and construction of five detached dwellings (all matters reserved) at 19 TOMS LANE, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 8NA, 20/0589/FUL - Part single, part first floor, part two storey side and rear extensions, connection of outbuilding to main dwelling, loft conversion include extension to roof, increase in ridge height and installation of front and rear dormers and construction of raised terraces at PIMLICO HOUSE, HYDE LANE, NASH MILLS, HP3 8SA and 20/0684/FUL - Single storey rear extension, alterations to existing first floor rear projection and insertion of front dormer window at 17 ADRIAN ROAD, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WD5 0AG, as a fellow Councillor was the Agent or had been involved in the plans for these applications.

PC 121/19 19/2190/FUL - Construction of all-weather playing field and erection of fencing and floodlighting (including changing existing lights), additional vehicular parking area; soft landscaping work and creation of grassed mound at ST CLEMENT DANES SCHOOL, CHENIES ROAD, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 6EW

The Planning Officer reported that the Local Lead Flood Authority remain concerned regarding some aspects of the drainage scheme and had requested, as of yesterday, that the LPA attach two conditions if they were minded to approve, which would deal with the outstanding matters. The applicant had agreed to the imposition of the recommended pre-commencement condition.

Additionally, Condition C15 needed to be amended very slightly so it would read as follows:

"The associated sport lighting (as set out within Conditions 7 & 8) serving the existing Hockey pitch and new all-weather pitch shall not be used outside the following hours at any time:

- 9am to (instead of "and") 9.15pm Monday to Friday;
- 9am to 8.15pm on Saturday, Sundays (including Bank and Public Holidays)."

In light of the changes, the Planning Officer recommendation should therefore be amended to remove the ability to delegate to the Director of Community and Environmental Services and would read:

That the application be GRANTED PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions and the additional conditions as requested by the LLFA.

The Planning Officer showed the plans on a shared screen.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked for the reason for the delay of this application as she thought it should have been heard at the April Planning Committee but this meeting was cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The Planning Officer replied the application was due to be heard at the April Committee meeting.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Committee virtual meeting protocol which sits alongside the Council Procedure Rules a speaker spoke against the application and a speaker spoke in support of the application.

Chorleywood Parish Council Councillor Zenab Haji-Ismail said that they welcomed this application and thanked officers for negotiating with the school to have the car parking reduced. It was acknowledged that there was a need for the pitch. The Parish Council were concerned about the 15 metre high lighting poles and asked if Officers could confirm this height was correct. The Planning Officer confirmed that to have the most optimal amount of lighting on the pitch 15 metres was the correct height. If it was any less that would create greater light spill from beyond the pitch and would have wider consequences. The technical data submitted with the application stated that 15 metres was the optimal height.

In response to the speaker against the application the Planning Officer said that having undertaken a site visit to Latimer Chase he could fully appreciate the residents concerns. As the report stated and recognized having the pitch closer to the properties could have greater consequences. The proposed lighting had been amended to ensure any light spill was in accordance with the AONB Management Plan. In addition the Planning Officer had been able to negotiate with the school to replace and upgrade the existing lighting to be more modern standard. Environmental Health had confirmed that the modern replacements would be of benefit to the local residents.

Councillor Stephen King asked if the opening times as stated in Condition C15 could be displayed on the gates. The Planning Officer said it would be down to the LPA to enforce the conditions and the Council did not know how the school would advertise this and it was not part of this application. An informative could be included to highlight advertising this information. If the application was approved and there were breaches of the planning conditions, then reports can be made to the LPA who can then issue the relevant enforcement.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes commented that the school, having a greater intake of students now than when the facilities were first there, must have increased pressure on the sports pitches. She also noted from the Sports England report that their current all weather pitch was only suitable for hockey. She could understand why this application had been made.

Councillor Peter Getkahn proposed, seconded by Councillor Stephen King, that the application be granted planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the officer report and the additional conditions as requested by the LLFA.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be GRANTED PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the conditions set out in the Officer report and the additional conditions as requested by the LLFA provided below:

Condition C15 to be amended to read as follows:

“The associated sport lighting (as set out within Conditions 7 & 8) serving the existing Hockey pitch and new all-weather pitch shall not be used outside the following hours at any time:

- 9am to (instead of “and”) 9.15pm Monday to Friday;
- 9am to 8.15pm on Saturday, Sundays (including Bank and Public Holidays).”

PC 122/19 20/0098/FUL - Demolition of existing garage and associated buildings and structures and the erection of a 75-bed care home (use class C2) with car parking and associated landscaping at Bridge Motors, 44 Church Street, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 1JE

Councillor Peter Gekthan left the meeting.

The Planning Officer reported that the LLFA had removed their objection and recommend that 3 conditions be included if the application was approved which had been agreed by the applicant. As a result, the Planning Officer recommendation had altered and now reads:

Subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, that the application be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions and the additional conditions as requested by the LLFA.

In addition, Condition C19 relating to flood warning had been amended slightly but no objection had been raised by Fire and Rescue.

The Planning Officer shared their screen to show the plans.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked about the parking as there seemed to be 25 parking spaces including 2 disabled spaces and thought there should be more parking spaces given the fact the building proposed would be a care home. Also what percentage of the rooms had private balconies or private areas so the residents could have the opportunity to sit outside. The Planning Officer confirmed that there were 25 parking spaces which included two disabled parking spaces which was in accordance with the Council’s standards. The applicant had advised that, as the scheme was operator led, throughout their discussions with the operator they believed that two spaces was all that was required. This followed previous schemes. It was appreciated that there was concern with the number of parking spaces. A parking management plan could be recommended prior to occupation which may put the onus on the applicant to find some evidence as to why only two spaces was adequate. In response to the point raised on balconies and private areas outside there would be 75 rooms in total with 14 rooms having their own private balconies which was 19% of the rooms and there would be two communal areas.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Committee virtual meeting protocol which sits alongside the Council Procedure Rules a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

Ward Councillor Paula Hiscocks said she had no issue with the site being used as a Care Home, but her issue was with the height and mass of the building and its lack of enhancement of the Conservation Area and the impact on the grade 1/2 historic buildings. If the Care Home was reduced to 2/3 storeys and incorporated some flint and stone detailing she felt it would not block the view of the historic corner of Rickmansworth and would marry into the Church War Memorial, and would be less overpowering at the rear. She also added concerns over the lack of parking and disabled parking spaces.

The Planning Officer replied that the Conservation Officer had objected and their comments on the amended scheme had advised that the harm was on the lower end of 'less than substantial harm'. The report acknowledged that the building was large, had crown roofs and was relatively excessive however, it was a balanced decision based on the positives provided by the scheme which included enhancing the locally listed buildings such as St Mary's Church and the War Memorial. The Planning Officer's professional judgement was that the use of flint and stone may appear to be competing with the church. There was a church extension abutting the site. It was a balanced decision and there were public benefits that would outweigh the harm which had been set out in the report.

Councillor Sara Bedford agreed with the Planning Officer's comments. She asked where the Grade 1 listed buildings in Rickmansworth were as referred to by the Ward Councillor. The Planning Officer advised that there were only Grade 2 listed buildings in the immediate vicinity of the application which were detailed within the report.

Councillor Sara Bedford said there were no long lists of resident's objections and this application would make a great contribution to the housing in the area.

Councillor Raj Khiroya said the proposed scheme would enhance the area and there was a need for the facilities for the community. Furthermore the report at Paragraph 4.2.2 stated that only four responses had been received and were all neutral including St Mary's Church.

The Planning Officer said the parking management plan would be considered if the scheme was approved.

The Planning Officer summed up that subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, that the application be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services to grant planning permission subject to the amended condition C19, those set out in the Officer report and the additional conditions as requested by the LLFA. If the additional condition regarding Parking Management is required this will also need to be added.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah Nemes, an amendment to the application for an additional condition regarding the requirement of Parking Management.

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

Councillor Raj Khiroya proposed, seconded by Councillor Keith Martin, that subject to the recommendation of approval from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, that the application be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services to grant

planning permission subject to the amended condition C19, the amendment of Parking Management, those set out in the Officer report and any additional conditions as requested by the LLFA.

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

RESOLVED:

That subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, that the application be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the amendment of condition C19, the amendment to require a Parking Management, and those conditions set out in the Officer report and any additional conditions as requested by the LLFA.

The Parking Management requirement Condition to read:

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Parking Management Plan shall include details and evidence as to the number of disabled parking spaces. The agreed details shall be adhered to thereafter.

Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to highway users in the interests of safety in accordance with Policies CP1, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

Councillor Peter Gekthan rejoined the meeting

Councillor Sarah Nelems left the meeting

Vice Chair Councillor Keith Martin in the Chair

PC 123/19 20/0258/RSP - Part-retrospective: Single-storey rear extension, first floor rear extension, raised terraces to the rear, part-loft conversion including front dormer windows and insertion of rooflights at 46 Clements Road, Chorleywood, WD3 5JT

The Planning Officer reported that Condition C2 should be updated to require details of the 1.8 metre privacy screen to be submitted to the LPA for approval and the wording to be:

“Within three months of the date of this decision, a 1.8m high privacy screen, details of which shall first be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall be erected along the eastern flank of the rear terrace as shown on drawing numbers ‘106 REV E, 107 REV B, 109 REV B and 110 REV A’. Once erected the privacy screen shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of No.44 Clements Road, 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 applicant had submitted photos/correspondence in support of their application. As set out in the agenda, the Planning Officers were recommending approval subject to conditions including an amendment to Condition C2 to ensure an appropriate privacy screen was erected.

Councillor Debbie Morris was pleased with the proposed amendment to the condition on the privacy screen but was concerned regarding the trellis would not provide enough screening and would like to see a solid barrier to ensure privacy.

The Planning Officer confirmed that a 1.8 metre screen had been erected on the correct point on the raised patio. It was a trellis style screen which was considered to allow views through so on Condition C2 it was suggested it be amended to require the details to be submitted to the Officers so they can ensure there was a solid screen with no overlooking to the lower neighbour at number 44.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Committee virtual meeting protocol which sits alongside the Council Procedure Rules a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Officer provided a photograph of the existing screen that had been erected. Amendments had been submitted. They had considered one outstanding aspect which was that the screen should be solid. The Officer recommendation was to grant planning permission as per the report with Condition C2 amended to require further details of the privacy screen to be erected.

Councillor Raj Khuroya moved, seconded by Councillor Peter Getkahn, that part retrospective planning permission be granted and has effect from the date on which the development is carried out and is subject to the amendment at Condition C2 and those conditions as set out in the Officer report.

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

RESOLVED:

That PART RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED and has effect from the date on which the development is carried out and is subject to the amendment at C2 and those conditions set out in the Officer report.

Amended Condition C2 to read:

"Within three months of the date of this decision, a 1.8m high privacy screen, details of which shall first be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall be erected along the eastern flank of the rear terrace as shown on drawing numbers '106 REV E, 107 REV B, 109 REV B and 110 REV A'. Once erected the privacy screen shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the occupiers of No.44 Clements Road, 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)."

Councillor Sarah Nelmes returned to the meeting

Councillor Sarah Nelmes in the Chair

PC 124/19 20/0268/FUL – Demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of replacement detached dwelling with loft accommodation served by front, side and rear dormers, creation of a carriage driveway to frontage including

provision of a new vehicular crossover at 7 CLEMENTS ROAD, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 5JS

The Planning Officer reported that there was no update but showed drawings and photos to the Committee.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Committee virtual meeting protocol which sits alongside the Council Procedure Rules a Parish Councillor spoke on the application.

Chorleywood Parish Councillor Zenab Haji-Ismail said that residents had been in touch and had objected to the application. It was not the principle of the replacement dwelling but having front, side and rear dormers which would make the dwelling look bulky and incongruous. She asked if the Committee would consider deferring the application for Officers to negotiate reducing the number of dormers.

The Planning Officer said the Committee had to consider the drawings in front of them. Officers had negotiated the size of the dormer windows but considering the street scene there were already a lot of other properties in the Road which had either front, side and rear dormer windows. The Planning Officer considered that the design was acceptable.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes moved, seconded by Councillor Sara Bedford, the officer recommendation that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to conditions as set out in the Officer report.

PC 125/19 20/0556/OUT - Outline application: Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and construction of five detached dwellings (all matters reserved) at 19 TOMS LANE, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 8NA

The Planning Officer reported there were no updates, however, the agent had queried some aspects of the Committee report so there were two points to be clarified.

On Kings Langley – the village argument for the purposes of Para 145 of the NPPF it states:

There is clear differentiation between the main village centre of Kings Langley and the application site. The two are physically separated by the business parks on the western side of Primrose Hill and Primrose Hill itself. As set out within report there is a clear character change between Primrose Hill and the eastern side of the railway line. This starts when travelling under the railway bridge and up the steep hill to Toms Lane. Whilst the application site is within a 0.6 mile (14 min) walk of the village centre it is not considered that the application site is located within the Village of Kings Langley for the purposes of Para 145.

Block Plan – Illustrative

Given that a block plan had been submitted the Planning Officer had given regard to this in the preparation of the report. However ultimately this application

seeks outline planning permission as to whether the principle of 5 (net gain 4) residential units are acceptable in this location. The reasons for refusal remain the same even if less weight was attached to the illustrative plan.

The Planning Officer said that the block plan was amended during the application to overcome Highways comments and therefore weight was given to this.

At this point in the meeting the Livestreaming failed at 8.46pm

It was therefore necessary to close the meeting.

PC126/19 RECOVERING THE MEETING

A motion was put to the Committee that the meeting be reconvened for Thursday 28 May 2020 at 7pm which was agreed unanimously by the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the meeting be reconvened for Thursday 28 May 2020 at 7pm.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

For a virtual/remote Reconvened meeting held on Thursday 28 May 2020 at 7pm to 7.46pm.

Councillors present:

Sarah Nelmes (Chairman)
Sara Bedford
Marilyn Butler
Steve Drury
Raj Khuroya
Michael Revan

Keith Martin (Vice Chairman)
Peter Getkahn
Chris Lloyd
Stephen King
Debbie Morris

Officers: Claire Westwood, Adam Ralton, Sarah Haythorpe, Sherrie Ralton

PC 127/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None received.

PC 128/19 20/0556/OUT - Outline application: Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and construction of five detached dwellings (all matters reserved) at 19 TOMS LANE, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 8NA

The Planning Officer reported there were no updates, however, the agent had queried some aspects of the Committee report so there were two points to be clarified.

On Kings Langley – the village argument for the purposes of Para 145 of the NPPF it states:

There is clear differentiation between the main village centre of Kings Langley and the application site. The two are physically separated by the business parks on the western side of Primrose Hill and Primrose Hill itself. As set out within report there is a clear character change between Primrose Hill and the eastern side of the railway line. This starts when travelling under the railway bridge and up the steep hill to Toms Lane. Whilst the application site is within a 0.6 mile (14

min) walk of the village centre it is not considered that the application site is located within the Village of Kings Langley for the purposes of Para 145.

Block Plan – Illustrative

Given that a block plan had been submitted the Planning Officer had given regard to this in the preparation of the report. However ultimately this application seeks outline planning permission as to whether the principle of 5 (net gain 4) residential units are acceptable in this location. The reasons for refusal remain the same even if less weight was attached to the illustrative plan.

The Planning Officer said that the block plan was amended during the application to overcome Highways comments and therefore weight was given to this.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Committee virtual meeting protocol which sits alongside the Council Procedure Rules a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Officer responded that the Green Belt matter referred to by the speaker was a matter of planning judgement and for the reasons set out in the report Officers did not consider it was a village nor was it infilling and therefore did not meet one of the exceptions of inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

It is an outline application so matters such as access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale were reserve matters. The principle of the character of 5 dwellings on that plot would still be an acceptable consideration. No affordable housing details were submitted with the application and no viability evidence, so at this time it was not in compliance with policy CP4 so that was a third reason for refusal.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked about the third reason, and the use of the word 'cramped'. She thought one of the properties looked a little cramped in terms of amenity space but the others looked to have a reasonable amount of space. She asked if they met our amenity space criteria or was the use of the word cramped in the context of the surrounding properties where the proposed development would provide a much reduced amenity space compared to the existing. The Planning Officer said that as it was an outline application they did not know the exact size of the dwellings, eg how many bedrooms there would be, so as set out in the report, they could not categorically say whether or not it complies with the amenity space standards. The plan sets out there would be amenity space around the dwellings but it was felt that word was appropriate in the broader context.

Councillor Raj Khuroya was surprised that Abbots Langley Parish Council had not commented. He asked whether any of the trees mentioned in the Conservation Officers report had TPOs on them. The Planning Officer advised that whilst not protected trees they were beneficial, providing valuable screening. The Landscape Officer did not raise an objection but indicated that any Reserve Matters Application would require further details to be submitted.

Councillor Sara Bedford advised that the Parish Council had not responded as an Abbots Langley Parish Councillor was involved in the application so they would not comment. Councillor Sara Bedford said that she supported the reasons for refusal.

The Planning Officer summed up as follows:

Members had not suggested any changes to the Officer recommendation to refuse Planning Permission on the three grounds as set out in the report. Firstly inappropriate development within the Green Belt, second character and the third related to the lack of affordable house.

Councillor Peter Getkahn moved, seconded by Councilor Stephen King, the recommendation that planning permission be refused for the reasons as set out in the Officer Report.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 9 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Committee virtual meeting protocol which sits alongside the Council Procedure Rules only Members present during the entire debate for an item were entitled to vote.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the reasons set out in the Officer Report

PC 129/19 20/0589/FUL - Part single, part first floor, part two storey side and rear extensions, connection of outbuilding to main dwelling, loft conversion include extension to roof, increase in ridge height and installation of front and rear dormers and construction of raised terraces at Pimlico House, Hyde Lane, Nash Mills, HP3 8SA

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates.

Councillor Debbie Morris said she understood a revised proposal of a reduced scheme in terms of narrower width of the extensions had been received but Officers had not had sufficient time to assess this. She asked if the application could be deferred to allow this to be assessed. She thought it was an improved scheme that would have less impact on the Green Belt than the current application. One of the main issues she was concerned with was the calculation of the existing space where Officers were not including the current loft space as part of the total square meterage of the property as it was not habitable. She understood from the applicant that it had sufficient headroom to be habitable space. The cottage had also not been included in the calculations because it was separate from the existing building but was 2.7 metres away, said to be dated from 1924 and is built with the same materials so could be included in the calculation. If both the cottage and loft space were included the proposed percentage increase is greatly reduced in the region of 44% on the current proposal and less on the revised proposal.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes advised that the revised scheme could not be assessed only the application before the Committee.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes asked whether there were any pre planning application discussions. The Planning Officer advised that there was no pre application engagement. The amendments only arrived this week after the meeting on 21 May 2020.

Councillor Peter Getkahn asked if the application was deferred would Members be able to look at the updated plans. The Planning Officer advised that if Members resolved to defer the application for Officers to consider the revised plans, these would need to be submitted as scaled formal plans. They could be accepted as part of the application and Officers could make an assessment

based on them. The assessment would be based on the plans in front of them, the impact on the Green Belt which is based in part on the floor area, the design and the bulk massing and what the extensions look like. They had provided their judgement in the report of how they think the presence of the cottage ought to be dealt with so they would consider that in the light of the new drawing.

Councillor Sara Bedford was happy for this application to be deferred providing it came back to the next Planning Committee meeting on 25 June.

The Planning Officer asked whether it was the intention that the application was being deferred solely for those exact elevations and plans to be prepared in a proper architectural format and submitted to Officers with no other additional tweaks and changes. Officers always encouraged applicants to engage with Officers before applications came in as this was the right time to have discussions and to work collaboratively to get applications to a positive point.

Councillor Sara Bedford was happy to amend the proposal to say it should return to the next Planning Committee.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked for the applicant to be given a deadline to submit the amended plans.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes pointed out that this opportunity had only arisen due to the failure of the livestreaming at the previous Planning Committee meeting so agreed this should not be allowed to continue to drag on.

Councillor Peter Getkahn asked whether the deadline would be achievable.

The member of the public agreed that it should be achievable.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said the applicant needed to turn the plans around quickly but they had been given the opportunity for pre consultation. He reluctantly supported deferment.

Councillor Sara Bedford agreed with Councillor Lloyd's comments but agreed to just one month deferment. The Planning Officer said they would give the applicant and his agents the time line to be met for the plans to be assessed to get to the next Committee.

The Planning Officers said they would need the plans by Friday 5 June 2020 in order to meet the deadline for the next Committee meeting.

Councillor Debbie Morris proposed, seconded by Councillor Peter Getkahn, that the application be deferred to the 25 June meeting on the basis that the new set of plans be amended only with the changes that had already been submitted.

The public speaker wished to defer speaking to the 25 June meeting.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to the 25 June 2020 meeting. A new set of plans to be submitted by Friday 5 June and to be amended with the changes that have already been submitted.

PC130/19 20/0610/ADV - Advertisement Consent: Installation of five internally illuminated fascia signs at The Centre, Gosforth Lane, South Oxhey, WD19 7AX

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates on this application.

Councillor Stephen King moved, seconded by Councillor Sara Bedford, the recommendation that advertisement consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the Officer report.

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

RESOLVED:

That ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT BE GRANTED subject to the conditions set out in the Officer report

PC131/19 20/0684/FUL - Single storey rear extension, alterations to existing first floor rear projection and insertion of front dormer window at 17 Adrian Road, Abbots Langley, WD5 0AG

The Planning Officer reported that there was no update to this application.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes said she understood this application had been brought to the Committee to ensure there was clear permission on the property rather than it being in bits and pieces.

The Planning Officer advised that a Lawful Development Certificate was granted for the rear dormer window and front roof lights and was under construction. If planning permission was granted for a front dormer window, rear roof lights, a first floor rear extension and ground floor extension this would regularise what was being built to ensure it was all covered.

A Member of the Public declined their right to speak.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes moved, seconded by Councillor Sara Bedford, the recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the Officer report.

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

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED, subject to the conditions set out in the Officer report.

CHAIRMAN