
PLANNING COMMITTEE**MINUTES**

For a virtual/remote meeting held on Thursday 16 July 2020 at 7.30pm to 8.03pm

Councillors present:

Sarah Nelmes (Chairman)
Chris Lloyd
Marilyn Butler
Steve Drury
Raj Khuroya

Keith Martin (Vice Chairman)
Debbie Morris
Phil Williams (Substitute)
Michael Revan (Substitute)
Stephen King

Also in attendance: Councillor Andrew Gallagher (Croxley Green Parish Council)

Officers: Adam Raltom, Claire Wilson, Angela Borges, Javier Anton-Garcia, Sarah Haythorpe and Jo Welton

PC 10/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Peter Getkahn, David Raw and Sara Bedford with the named substitute members being Councillor Phil Williams and Michael Revan.

PC 11/20 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 25 June 2020 were not available and will be presented at the 13 August 2020 Planning Committee to be confirmed as a correct record.

PC 12/20 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

The Committee noted that item 6 (20/0315/FUL – Laying of new 3.2 metre wide single track road and five speed cushions, stretching from the junction of South Cottage Gardens down to the junction of Berry Lane and construction of double swing gates at both ends at LOWER (SOUTH) END OF SOUTH PARK AVENUE, CHORLEYWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE)

Had been withdrawn from this meeting on 16 July 2020.

PC 13/20 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 Councillor’s. The Committee Report in itself is not the sole piece of information to

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

PC 14/20 Consideration of objections and confirmation of the Three Rivers (6 Claremont Crescent, Croxley Green) Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 2019 – TPO 913

The Landscape Officer reported that one objection had been received. The tree is located in the back garden of No.6 Claremont Crescent, adjacent to No.8 Claremont Crescent and was a large, mature and healthy tree. Being a Beech tree it provided privacy to the area and added high value and was visible from Claremont Crescent and Winton Drive. The tree was contributing to the public amenity value in the area.

The tree provided habitat to the wildlife, including birds, and had an ecological value. It is a native species, therefore there were animals that depended on this kind of species. A Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Order (TEMPO) was made at the time of the first inspection, and had been checked again recently. It had been concluded that making the TPO would be defensible.

The Landscape Officer had visited the area and road, and if the tree was not protected for the future there would be less trees in the area and this tree should be protected. The owner of the tree had removed a small conifer adjacent to this tree, to allow the TPO tree to grow more symmetrical, and be more healthy and in better condition for the future.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said as one of the Ward Councillors he had visited the site and was happy with the officer recommendation to confirm the TPO.

Councillor Steve Drury accepted the recommendation but pointed out that the map showing the tree did not show the tree in Claremont Crescent but one in the gardens of Winton Drive and asked if this could be confirmed.

The Landscape Officer confirmed that the tree is located at No.6 Claremont Crescent.

Councillor Phil Williams said that the Council were losing too many trees across the District, and fully supported the recommendation.

Councillor Marilyn Butler said the wildlife should be protected and it was important to protect the tree. There are not a lot of trees in that area and this tree is a great asset and supported the recommendation.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved, seconded by Councillor Steve Drury, 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 as set out in the report.

PC 15/20 20/0315/FUL – Laying of new 3.2 metre wide single track road and five speed cushions, stretching from the junction of South Cottage Gardens down to the junction of Berry Lane and construction of double swing gates at both ends at LOWER (SOUTH) END OF SOUTH PARK AVENUE, CHORLEYWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE

Application withdrawn from this meeting.

PC 16/20 20/0660/FUL: Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) attached to planning permission 16/1218/FUL (Demolition of existing care home and construction of replacement three storey care home with additional basement, associated parking and landscaping) to allow for changes to the design including increase in ridge height, alterations to the depth and width, alterations to fenestration detail, alterations to internal layout to provide for larger bedrooms and alterations to amenity space at BURFORD HOUSE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, CHORLEYWOOD, HERTS

The Planning Officer reported that Condition C1 would be updated to include the revisions to the plan numbers. Condition C6 to be updated to read as follows:

“The second floor tilt and turn window on the flank elevation shall be obscure glazed and shall be fixed shut at all times other than when required to be opened to provide access to the roof for maintenance purposes, the window shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter. Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties in accordance with policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and policy DM1 and appendix 2 of the Development Management Policy LDD.”

The Planning Officer clarified the differences between the proposed elevations from the 2016 approved application to this application (via the shared pictures on the screen).

The Chair noted that there was not a lot of difference in height and size from the 2016 approved application.

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.

Councillor Debbie Morris had concerns regarding the parking. Whilst she appreciated that the shortfall remained the same at 3 spaces, it would be more helpful if there was a Parking Management Plan, so that residents and visitors could have priority spaces over staff who may not need to be so close to the building. Currently there were 2 disabled spaces provided and asked if it was possible that a Parking Management Plan be included as Condition should planning permission be granted.

Councillor Raj Khuroya referred to Paragraph 7.3.7 of the report which referred to the application passed in 2016. This building was not fit for purpose, and the amendment presented today was not significant and there was a demand for this type of accommodation in the District.

The public benefit outweighed the harm to the openness, and we should grant permission as it would be in the best interest of the area and the public.

The Planning Officer clarified that Parking Management Plan could be added as a Condition if Members were minded to grant the application.

The Chair agreed with Councillor Khiroya in that we had not met the demand for housing for older people in this area. The home that was there before had received very good results from the residents, but the age of the building made it not fit for modern day care purposes.

Councillor Steve Drury commented that the parking around the building had always been inadequate and that a Parking Management Plan would be a good idea as the building had expanded and there would be more bedrooms.

The Chair moved the recommendation that Planning Permission be Granted subject to the conditions set out in the officer report, with the addition of a Parking Management Plan to be submitted seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya.

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 to also include an additional condition requiring submission of Parking Management Plan. The wording of the 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 regarding the allocation of visitor and employee parking provision. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

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).

And the updated Conditions C1 and C6 to read:

C1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 19-092-100 Rev C, 19-092-101 Rev B, 19-092-055 Rev B, 19-092-056 Rev B, 19-092-057 Rev A, 19-092-058 Rev C, 19-092-120 Rev G, 19-092-121 Rev R, 19-092-122 Rev H, 19-092-123 Rev J, 19-092-124 F, 19-092-150 E, 19-092-151 F, D7. 1B, D7.2H, 19-092-103 Rev C, D6.1G, TPP/BHRRCH/010/E1 , TPP/BHRRCH/010/E2

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, in the proper interests of planning, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt; in accordance with Policies CP1, CP9, CP10, CP11 and CP12; of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM2, DM3, DM6, DM8, DM9, DM13 and of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the Chorleywood Common Conservation Area Appraisal

C6 The second floor tilt and turn window on the flank elevation shall be obscure glazed and shall be fixed shut at all times other than when required to be opened to provide access to the roof for maintenance purposes, the window shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter. Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties in accordance with policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and policy DM1 and appendix 2 of the Development Management Policy LDD.

PC 17/20 20/1036/FUL – Single storey front extension, construction of front dormers and front rooflight and replacement of pitched roof over rear extension with

**parapet wall at 16 WINTON CRESCENT, CROXLEY GREEN,
HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 3QX**

The Planning Officer reported there were no updates and presented the plans and photo's including street scene to the Committee.

The Chair asked for clarification that the original bungalow was one of the taller bungalows in the street. The Planning Officer confirmed this was correct.

Croxley Parish Councillor Andrew Gallagher spoke against the application drawing attention to the fact the property was unchanged since 1950. Last year a Certificate of Lawfulness was granted for a substantial rear extension and loft conversion with velux windows to the front. Now permission was sought for a significant alteration to the front of the building which was not in accordance with the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The drawings submitted in October 2019 were the same as those for the Certificate of Lawfulness. The proposed front extension of 1.6m would distort the alignment of the street scene. Policy CA2 of the Neighbourhood Plan said domestic extensions require consent and should seek to conserve and enhance the character of the area through the careful control of massing, alignment and height. Extensions which have an overbearing or adverse effect on the character area will be resisted and take account of the guidelines in Appendix C. He drew attention to the Planning Officer comments at Paragraph 7.1.5 and at Paragraph 7.1.9 of the report. The proposed front extension would project significantly in front and would be a conspicuous alteration in the street scene. The Parish Council request that this application be refused.

Councillor Steve Drury lost connection to the Planning meeting at 19.53, the Chair agreed to adjourn the meeting until his connection could be re-established as per the Council's Livestreaming Protocol (see below). Councillor Steve Drury rejoined the meeting at 19.59 and the meeting continued.

Livestreaming - *Under the virtual meeting regulations that govern the conduct of meetings held remotely it is a requirement that not only should all members present be able to hear and be heard, where the meeting is in public any member of the public attending remotely should also be able to hear the debate. Therefore in the event that, for any reason, connectivity is lost with the live streaming, the Officer responsible for monitoring the live streaming will immediately notify the Chair who will adjourn the meeting until such time as the live stream has been restored. In the event that it cannot be restored within 10 minutes of the start of the adjournment the Chair will adjourn the meeting to another date and time.*

Councillor Debbie Morris asked for the Planning Officer's comment on the Parish Councils concerns that the proposed front extension would distort the alignment on the street scene.

The Planning Officer replied that as set out in the Officers report ultimately in the officers view the front extension would be a fairly small projection forward although this is a judgement. The 1.6m forward projection would not occupy the full width of the property. The roof is lower than the main roof and is quite a subservient addition to the host property. Whilst it would project forward, projecting forward in its self does not necessarily result in harm to the character of the street scene and this is set out in the report.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said he had visited the site. Due due to all the scaffolding the site looked bulkier than it is, but he wanted to know what the difference in height between the application site and No.14 Winton Crescent was both now and after the development. Looking at the site it did appear bulky.

The Planning Officer said that there would be no height difference, the main roof was not being increased in height. The scaffolding was in place for the dormer window construction to the rear.

The Chair commented that it was not a particularly substantial build and that a Certificate of Lawfulness was within the planning law and moved that the officer recommendation be approved.

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

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared 8 For, 1 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

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

CHAIR