
PLANNING COMMITTEE**MINUTES**

For a virtual/remote meeting held on Thursday 13 August 2020 at 7.30pm to 8.15pm

Councillors present:

Councillors:-

Chris Lloyd (Chairman)

Raj Khuroya (Vice-Chairman)

Stephanie Singer (substitute for Cllr Sara Bedford)

Marilyn Butler

Steve Drury

Peter Getkahn

Keith Martin

Stephen King

Debbie Morris

David Raw

Alison Scarth

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

Officers: Adam Ralton, Claire Wilson, Sarah Haythorpe

PC 18/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Sara Bedford with the named substitute member being Councillor Stephanie Singer.

PC 19/20 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on 25 June 2020 and 16 July 2020 to be confirmed as a correct record by the Chair of the meeting.

PC 20/20 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

The Committee noted that item 6 (20/1157/FUL & 20/1158/LBC - Demolition of existing extension and outbuildings and construction of two storey side extension, single storey front and rear extensions, changes to roof form and construction of replacement outbuildings at The Windmill, 34 WINDMILL DRIVE, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE)

Had been withdrawn.

PC 21/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Chris Lloyd read out the following statement to the Committee:

“All Members are reminded that they should come to meetings with an open mind and be able to demonstrate that they are open minded. You should only come to your decision after due consideration of all the information provided, whether by planning officers in the introduction, by applicants/agents, by objectors or by fellow 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.”

Councillor Debbie Morris wished to declare that the Conservative Councillors on the Committee had a non-pecuniary interest in item 5. (20/1050/FUL - Single storey rear extension at VRUNDA, 1 GLENCORSE GREEN, SOUTH OXHEY, HERTS WD19 6ER) as the applicant is a member of the Conservative group.

PC 22/20 20/1050/FUL - Single storey rear extension at Vrunda, 1 Glencorse Green, South Oxhey, WD19 6ER

The Planning Officer reported there were no updates and presented the plans and photos to the Committee.

Councillor Alison Scarth’s only concern was the amount of amenity space as mentioned in the officer’s report. It was a large house with four bedrooms with quite a small garden.

The Planning Officer said as the report set out there was a shortfall against the indicative levels set out in the development plan, but for the reasons given in the report Officers did not consider that would result in harm to the quality of the remaining space.

Councillor Stephen King moved, seconded by Councillor Raj Khuroya, 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 of the meeting the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

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

PC 23/20 20/1157/FUL & 20/1158/LBC - Demolition of existing extension and outbuildings and construction of two storey side extension, single storey front and rear extensions, changes to roof form and construction of replacement outbuildings at The Windmill, 34 Windmill Drive, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 3FD

Application Withdrawn.

PC 24/20 20/1236/FUL - Subdivision of the site and construction of Chalet bungalow and construction of vehicular access onto Greenbury Close at The Croft, 62 Green Street, Chorleywood, WD3 5QR

The Planning Officer reported that an application was refused in 2019 due to the impact on the streetscene. As such, it was helpful to clarify the differences between the refused scheme and that now proposed. The dwelling proposed in the refused application had a ridge height of 6.8m rising to 7.4m due to levels on the site. The current proposed dwelling had a maximum ridge height of 6.8m. The siting of the dwelling had now also been altered. In 2019, the refused dwelling was sited so

that the front elevation faced directly towards the boundary with No.2 Greenbury Close with a single storey garage located immediately adjoining the boundary. The current siting of the dwelling angled the front entrance towards Greenbury Close so that it would appear to have more of a frontage to the street. The detached garage in the refused scheme had been removed completely. The refused dwelling would have been located approximately 4.1 metres from the boundary with No.2 Greenbury Close. The proposed dwelling would be sited a minimum of 5.5 metres from the boundary with No.2 Greenbury Close. The roof form of the dwelling had been altered and the design and siting of the dormer windows changed.

Councillor Stephen Drury asked if the two large tree stumps in the photograph had been protected trees and whether they had been felled without permission? The Planning Officer said that there were no protected trees on the site.

Councillor David Raw said the new dwelling would be very close to the boundary of the neighbouring house and asked what the difference was between this application and the 2019 application.

The Planning Officer said the previous application was not refused due to the impact on the neighbours. The main issue with the previous application was that it was sited so the whole of the front elevation was facing towards No.2 Greenbury Close. When you approached the site it would have felt extremely cramped and did not respond to the curve of the cul de sac. The current siting had been pushed back by 1.3 metres which opened up the space around the building along with the removal of the detached garage. In terms of spacing to the boundaries with the neighbours the first floor development would be sited 1.2 metres from the boundary. With regard to No.62 Green Street, which backs onto the site, the spacing would be 2.1 metres from the boundary. It was a smaller plot but was appropriate for a development of this size.

Councillor Marilyn Butler pointed out that the cul-de-sac was set out with chalet style bungalows and this development looked more like a house. She asked what the dimension of the front of the plot was going to be onto Greenbury Close as it looked very squashed.

The Planning Officer said the street scene was that of chalet style bungalows and Officers felt that the design of this house would fit in with the street scene.

Councillor Debbie Morris said there was some discrepancy in the report at Paragraphs 7.3.5 and 7.3.6. It stated in Paragraph 7.35 that it would appear as a chalet bungalow in terms of height and design but in Paragraph 7.36 it stated that it would not have the appearance of a traditional bungalow. In addition, because of the footprint of the building being 11.8 x 11.8 metres it would be a square design and because of its height it does give an appearance of a house. She agreed with the comment on the narrow frontage.

The Planning Officer showed the front boundary dimensions which would be around 10 metres back from the boundary. The site had a narrow frontage but it was no different from other cul de sac entrances and the site opened up towards the rear. The south west elevation fronting towards Greenbury Close would have the catslide roof and its appearance with the dormer window at the first floor level made it appear as a bungalow. It was slightly different at the rear and at the side elevations but would from the front and at the street level it would have a chalet style. Officers feel that it was in keeping with the appearance of Greenbury Close.

Councillor David Raw asked why the dwelling had not been moved back towards the rear as it might fit in better with the general layout of the other houses in the area. The house is going to be too far forward and out of keeping.

Councillor Peter Getkahn said his comments were made based around the look of the area. There were issues with elements of this application which should be discussed further but discussing the design of it was inappropriate due to the site not being in a Conservation Area. The dwelling would not be so different from other buildings in the streetscene to warrant any sort of change. There would have to be something vastly different to justify any sort of change. However he was a little sympathetic to the comment about it being squeezed into the site and did seem quite hemmed in. He was struggling to find a planning reason to oppose it although he was aware it did feel like backland development.

Councillor Marilyn Butler said that the right hand side of the house with the catslide roof still looked like a house. The dwelling next door would be dominated by this new dwelling with the garden going right up the side of the drive. She was not satisfied with the width of the drive to the new dwelling and it was not in keeping with the area.

Councillor Stephen King asked if the driveway could be put in first as it would save them driving over the grass verge.

The Planning Officer said Herts Highways had no objections to the width of the access or the driveway. They had not suggested any specific highways related conditions and it would not be appropriate to include any and to ask the applicant to build the driveway first before construction of the house. The grass verge would go once the dropped kerb and driveway were installed. Temporary arrangements for the construction works would be required. The applicant would need to seek permission from Herts Highways for the dropped kerb.

The Chair of the meeting advised that Informative I6 covered this.

Councillor Stephanie Singer said that the properties around this plot were not uniformed and the design for this property did not seem to be a problem.

Parish Councillor Zenab Haji-Ismail said the Parish objected to the application. The reasons were that the site location plan and proposed block plan demonstrated that the proposal was an uncharacteristic form of backland development. In relation to the impact on the neighbouring amenity, the first floor window would look directly into the neighbours rear garden at No.60 Green Street. The report failed to address Paragraph 122D of the NPPF which acknowledges the desirability of maintaining the prevailing character and setting of residential gardens. Whilst there is a need for housing in the District, it does not mean we should allow any housing. If a development was allowed here it should be for a smaller house that meets with the identified needs of the District and has less impact on the neighbouring amenities.

The Planning Officer showed the Location plan showing where the windows were positioned. The dormer windows would face the rear neighbouring garden and not the private amenity space. Officers felt that it would not cause demonstrable harm. There were rooflights in the flank elevation facing towards No.62 Green Street and a condition had been included which would require them to be a minimum of 1.7 metres above floor level.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved that Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions, seconded by Councillor Stephen King, as he had not heard valid

concerns to refuse the application. If the application went to appeal there would be insufficient grounds to defend the appeal.

The Planning Officer said if Members wished to overturn the Officer recommendation and refuse the application they should be minded of the comments in the report at Paragraph 7.11. It stated that the the Local Authority could not demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and the balance tipped in favour of approving the planning application unless any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. If Members were to consider refusal it was very important to explain exactly why and provide details of the reasons.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair of the meeting the voting being 7 For, 3 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

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

PC25/20

Councillors Steve Drury and Chris Lloyd wanted to thank the planning officers for putting the reports together at this difficult time and for all their hard work.

CHAIR