
PLANNING COMMITTEE**MINUTES**

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber at Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, on Thursday 18 November 2021 from 7.30pm to 10.00pm.

Councillors present:

Steve Drury (Chair)	Ruth Clark
Raj Khiroya (Vice Chair)	Keith Martin
Alex Hayward	Chris Lloyd
Margaret Hofman (named substitute for Cllr Sara Bedford)	Alison Scarth
Debbie Morris	
David Raw	

Also in attendance: Councillors Alison Wall and Andrew Scarth, Batchworth Community Councillor Craige Coren, Chorleywood Parish Councillor Jon Bishop, Croxley Green Parish Councillor Andrew Gallagher

Officers: Kimberley Rowley, Adam Ralton, Claire Westwood, Tom Norris and Sherrie Ralton

PC 89/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sara Bedford, with Cllr Margaret Hofman as the named substitute, and also from Councillor Stephen King.

PC 90/21 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 18 November 2021 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair.

PC 91/21 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business

PC 92/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Planning Committee declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 as the land was owned by Three Rivers District Council.

Councillor Alex Hayward declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 and would leave the meeting for this application.

Two officers who had an interest in item 5 and left the meeting for this application.

Councillor Raj Khiroya advised that he was a Chorleywood Parish Councillor but did not sit on the Planning Committee.

Councillor Steve Drury 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 93/21 21/1190/FUL – Construction of a single storey front and rear extension, part two storey front, side and rear extension including Juliet balcony to principal elevation, fenestration alterations at 24 SHERFIELD AVENUE, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 1NL

The Planning Officer updated that paragraph 2.4 of the report stated that number 26 had no extensions to the rear, which was incorrect and went on to say that number 26 had a part single, part two storey front side and rear extension, which was correct and was reflected in the rest of the report.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved the recommendation, duly seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya

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

RESOLVED:

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

Councillor Alex Hayward left the meeting for the next application (item 6)

PC 94/21 21/1579/FUL – Two-storey side extension, two-storey rear extensions including insertion of rear rooflights at loft level, construction of lower ground floor level, alterations to fenestration, and increase to front hardstanding at 11 RUSSELL ROAD, MOOR PARK, HA6 2LJ

The Planning Officer had one update from the Conservation Officer on the amended plans. There was no objection to the front aspect. The side extension was considered to be subservient. The rear extensions remained substantial to the original property. There were concerns over the contrasting appearance on the front and the rear. Concerns over the substantial loss of the original building fabric and concerns over the amount of glazing surrounding the front entrance and door.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor David Raw noted the Conservation Officer’s objections and asked if the Officer had any comments on the objections.

The Planning Officer advised that since the comments in the report the scheme had been amended. The front door had been relocated back to its original position. The side extension set down from what it was originally. The rear extension had also been reduced in height and width. Officers felt this addressed the concerns.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) Councillor Craig Coren, Batchworth Community Councillor spoke on the application.

Councillor Craig Coren said Batchworth Community Council had objected to this application. It was built prior to 1958 and was therefore of special significance in the conservation area. There were substantial changes externally and internally resulting in a large new building in anything but name. The scale of the proposed works was excessive. It would take the house to less than one metre from the boundaries and would be extended from 2 storeys to 4 storeys. The front façade would be altered considerably. There would be a considerable increase to hard standing at the front of the site which together with the construction of a basement would materially affect the water table and drainage. The area as a whole was subject to flooding and it was important that TRDC & BCC work together to look at the effect these developments were having. A detailed drainage plan should be sought as part of the planning process. They believed the size and scale would have an impact on the neighbours and their privacy, particularly the full width balcony terrace.

Councillor Debbie Morris said it was unfortunate not to have received the Conservation Officer update in advance. Moor Park 58 had contacted Planning Committee Members asking whether any of the existing rear elevation would survive the scale of the proposed rear development of the site. Where any of the rear elevation was not subsumed and where was any part of the original rear elevation decipherable. The Planning Officer said that although the Conservation Officer said the rear elevation would be subsumed across the full width, the Officers did not consider this would alter the experience of the dwelling within the conservation area despite the alterations.

Councillor Morris pointed out that the Officer report said the large extensions to the rear were acceptable on the basis that they could not be seen from any public viewpoint but that was in direct contradiction to what the Conservation Officer advised in their report. At 4.1.2 they said 'lack of visibility does not equate to lack of harm'. Rear elements could be seen from rear gardens in the conservation area. The Councillor saw no reason why this should not be refused on the basis that the scheme was harmful to the conservation area. Also the Officer said that rear extensions were largely obscured but did not reference the gardens that the Conservation Officer does. The Officer recognised the cumulative impact of the extra wrapping around the house and the further explanation to the rear stated it did not harm the character of the dwelling, however the plans showed a 4 storey building to the rear.

Councillor Debbie Morris advised the reason for refusal would be harm to the conservation area and the pre 1958 building.

The Planning Officer asked to clarify the reasons for refusal which were understood to be the result of the scale of the proposed extension which would subsume the original building and the loss of the original features, the resulting

harm to both the pre 1958 building and the conservation area. Was this just the extensions to the rear or the side extension?

Councillor Debbie Morris wanted to site all the points the Conservation Officer had concerns about. Glazing to the front and a substantial loss of the original building.

Councillor Raj Khiroya asked if the Officer had taken into account the response from the Conservation Officer and that there was no objection from Moor Park 1958 and was still minded that permission should be granted?

The Planning Officer pointed out that they had consulted with the Conservation Officer and had noted their comments and the report justified why Planning Officers had come to that recommendation.

Councillor Debbie Morris pointed out that Moor Park 1958 had objected to the application and there had been an updated objection that afternoon.

Councillor Debbie Morris, moved an amendment to the recommendation, duly seconded by Councillor David Raw to refuse Planning Permission.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared LOST by the Chair the voting being 2 For, 3 Against and 4 Abstentions

Councillor Margaret Hofman moved the Officer recommendation, duly seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya, that Planning Permission be granted.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 3 For, 2 Against and 4 Abstentions

RESOLVED:

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

Councillor Alex Hayward returned to the meeting.

PC 95/21

21/1703/FUL - Demolition of the existing dwelling and detached garage, subdivision of site and construction of two dwellings and associated works at DONKEY GATE, CORAL GABLES, SOLESBRIDGE LANE, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 5SN

The Planning Officer reported that the application was deferred for Members to make a site visit and for officers to seek highways comments. HCC Highways did not object to the proposals and similarly, the Fire Service did not object to the proposals. The Fire Service required a sprinkler system to both dwellings and this had been conditioned (Condition 14). A further parking space had been added to Plot 2 to ensure parking provision was policy compliant. It was also suggested that Condition C3 (Construction Management Plan) be updated to include a requirement for details of delivery vehicles.

The Planning Officers were aware that Members had received an objection letter directly today. Whilst HCC as Highway Authority had raised no objections, officers forwarded to them this afternoon the letter and attachments. They remain of the professional opinion that the proposal was acceptable on highways grounds. They had said; *after discussion with others*

in my team, the only additional comments I have to make is that the traffic would not be expected to be significantly different from the current situation as the use of the access is to only be intensified by one dwelling. Regarding the swept path drawings provided, it would not be expected that a vehicle of these sizes would have to enter the site on a regular basis, if at all. If required, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) could also be requested to ensure vehicles which would use the access could fit. The refuse arrangements are to stay the same as they are currently, so it would be expected that TRDC Waste Management are satisfied with the access arrangements.

A Construction Management Plan was already required by condition (C3) and officers are suggesting that this be amended to include details of delivery vehicles.

With regards to the sketch plan provided which showed additional dwellings on the site, that was not a proposal before Members. Members must consider the current application for 1 additional dwelling on its merits.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) Ward Councillor Alison Wall spoke on the application.

Councillor Alison Wall said the application was within the Metropolitan Green Belt and partly within the conservation area and alongside an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This was back land development rather than infill as the report stated. The Councillor referred to policy document DM1 paragraph 7.3.3 and said against Point ii) the access was extremely awkward. Solesbridge Lane was a very narrow lane. Point iii) This would generate excess levels of traffic. Point iv) There would be a significant loss to residential amenity with the excess traffic and the road would have to be closed for utilities to be installed to the extra dwelling. The Councillor recommended objection.

The Planning Officer advised that the site was not within the AONB but the north and west boundaries adjoined it. The main part of the site was within the green belt but not within the conservation area. The vehicular access was within the conservation area not the green belt. It was considered the existing building was closer to the boundary with the AONB than the replacement building. This was not inappropriate development within the green belt. With regards the awkward access, it was the existing access serving one existing dwelling and as identified in the update the Highways Authority did not consider that the access serving one additional dwelling would be harmful or that there would be excessive traffic. There was not considered to be harm to residential amenities as set out in the report.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) Chorleywood Parish Councillor Jon Bishop spoke on the application.

Councillor Jon Bishop highlighted inconsistencies between the comments from HCC Highways on this application and the comments on the previous application for this site earlier this year when the applicant had proposed increasing the width of the access way from 3.3 to 6.7 metres to ensure vehicles did not have to reverse onto the highway. The widening of the access way was not included in the latest proposal, presumably as it caused adverse comment from the Conservation Officer last time, and despite there being no changes HCC Highway's new report made no reference to the narrowness of

Solesbridge Lane where the access joined it. No concerns had been raised about vehicles having to reverse out onto this dangerous section of the road if the access was not widened. For these reasons they asked for this application to be refused.

The Planning Officer's view was that HCC Highways had scrutinised this application and found it to be acceptable on highways grounds. It was one additional dwelling and they did not consider that the intensification of use of the access would result in demonstrable harm on highways grounds. From an Officer point of view, they would not be support by the Highways Authority if they objected to the Application on Highways grounds.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said the issue raised could mean they should defer the application to go back to HCC Highways as there seemed to be an inconsistency. The Councillor would want very detailed conditions if the Application was approved of where vehicles were going to park.

Following a question from Councillor Raj Khiroya, the Planning Officer confirmed that it was not procedure for a Planning Officer to accompany a Highways Officer on a site visit and they could not confirm whether a Highways Officer had visited the site. The Planning Officer pointed out that the update had quoted 'after discussion with others in my team', so although it may not be the same Officer who looked at the previous application, there had clearly been a discussion within their team on highways grounds.

Councillor Alex Hayward asked who was responsible for the road access off Solesbridge Lane. The Planning Officer said it was not owned by HCC. The Councillor added that Highways would have only commented on access in and out of the drive, not on the difficulties on that drive on a daily basis. If the number of dwellings was increasing there would be an increase in the number of cars which would add to the congestion and there was no parking control.

Councillor David Raw pointed out that in 4.1.7 Herts Fire and Rescue stated a fire appliance would not be able to access the new proposed dwellings via Donkey Gate.

The Planning Officer understood the concerns being raised about an existing situation but this application has to be considered and could not be used to put something else right. With regards fire vehicles, this was why they had required sprinklers which was not uncommon and they raised no objection subject to that and condition 14.

Councillor Raj Khiroya said the issue of access remained and the Councillor would not be able to support the Officer recommendation.

Councillor Alex Hayward asked if they were still within the time to defer. The Planning Officer confirmed that Members could defer the application again. The Applicant could appeal non-determination. Deferring this to seek clarification from the Highways Authority may be the appropriate thing to do.

Councillor Chris Lloyd advised that the deferral would be to establish why Highways gave one set of advice on the previous application, whereas that access had not changed. Also were there any other points that needed to be raised?

Councillor Debbie Morris said they could not commit to which meeting they would make a decision at.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved a motion to defer the application for further clarification from HCC Highways, duly seconded by Councillor David Raw.

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 seek further clarification from HCC relating to their response to this application and response to previous application.

.PC 96/21

21/2090/FUL: Demolition of a pair of semi-detached buildings and erection of two pairs of three storey semi-detached dwellings to accommodate 4x3 bedroom dwellings with associated alterations to vehicular access and provision of landscaping and parking at 165-167 HAMPERMILL LANE, OXHEY HALL, Herts

The Planning Officer had no update.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a Member of the Public spoke against the application.

The Planning Officer said the design incorporating the flat roof was acknowledged in the report but for the reasons set out in the report Officers did not consider that it was resulting in demonstrable harm to justify refusal. The proposals in terms of height and massing and materials were considered to be appropriate. There was no requirement for solar panels. There was a requirement for a 5% saving, but the saving in this case was 14% which exceeded current policy. The relationship with the footway was acceptable.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) Ward Councillor Andrew Scarth spoke on the application.

Councillor Andrew Scarth said a new build should fit into the street scene. The flat roof design is nowhere else on the Oxhey Hall Estate and a pitched roof would have gone some way to copying the other properties. Affinity Water reported that this site was part of its ground water source protection zone. Any planting on the boundary wall would have a negative impact on the visibility for vehicles emerging onto Hampermill Lane. The width of the footway is 1 metre so a new boundary wall would need to be set back further for the safety of pedestrians.

A Member of the Public advised that Councillor Stephen King was due to read out a statement but had not attended the meeting so asked if they could read it out instead. The Chair ruled that in accordance with Rule 35(b) (a) only one person to speak in support of and one person to speak against each agenda item so this was not possible.

The Chair advised that the Parish Council objection had been received.

The Planning Officer advised that Affinity Water had not objected. They had asked for a number of planning conditions that had been set out in the report.

Councillor Keith Martin said the site needed to be developed but had three issues:

- There were no other flat roofed buildings in the area
- The Officer's report said Unit 3 had a shortfall of amenity space
- Paragraph 7.10.2 of the report noted a shortfall of 4 parking spaces. There was no pavement to the nearest bus stop on that side of the road. This was a very busy road to cross with the safe crossing a 12 minute walk away.

Councillor Debbie Morris agreed that the parking shortfall was significant and there was no off street parking. Hertfordshire Highways had expressed concerns about the absence of measure to deal with surface water drainage.

The Planning Officer said that Members had explained that the scale and bulk incorporating such a different design was considered out of character and harmful. Regarding amenity space, 3 of the properties comply with the guidance. One has a small shortfall of 12 square metres and they would not recommend permission was refused on that basis. It is a shortfall of 4 parking spaces so if Members considered that harmful it could be a reason for refusal. With regards surface water drainage there were conditions and this could be dealt with by conditions as set out in the report. Members have to be clear that the adverse impacts of the development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Councillor Alex Hayward said at 7.10.3 says that a condition would be added requiring a garage to be retained for off street parking. This would potentially be another parking space short. The Planning Officer advised that if Members were minded to refuse the application due to the parking shortfall, reference to reliance on garages could be included in the wording of that reason.

Councillor David Raw said the buildings were out of character and detrimental to the area and would be voting against this.

Councillor Raj Khuroya said paragraph 4.1.5 stated that initially the Highways Authority had raised an objection to the application due to highway safety concerns. Subsequently they came back with no objection but the Councillor felt it was still of concern.

Councillor Alison Scarth moved the recommendation, duly seconded by Councillor Keith Martin to refuse the application on the grounds of insufficient car parking and unacceptable design.

On being put to the Committee the Officer recommendation was overturned, the recommendation to REFUSE the application was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

R1 The proposed development by reason of its scale, bulk and design incorporating flat roofs would appear as an unsympathetic and obtrusive form of development which would result in a contrived and unduly prominent form of development uncharacteristic of and harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies CP1, CP3 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

R2 The proposed development would fail to provide sufficient off-street parking to serve the development which would result in an increase in pressure for parking outside of the application site to the detriment of highway safety, the character of the area and residential amenity. There would also be an over reliance on private garages to provide parking which may not be retained in perpetuity, thereby further exacerbating the parking shortfall. The site is not considered to be an accessible location where a shortfall against standards may be acceptable and occupiers of the development would be reliant on private cars. The development is therefore contrary to Policies CP1, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013).

R3 In the absence of an agreement under the provisions of Section 106 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the development would not contribute to the provision of affordable housing. The proposed development therefore fails to meet the requirements of Policy CP4 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (approved June 2011).

PC 97/21 21/2153/FUL - Partial demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of part single, part two-storey side and rear extensions with loft conversion and alterations to vehicular access and driveway and repositioning of gates and walls to frontage at 13 HEATHSIDE ROAD, MOOR PARK, HA6 2EE

The Planning Officer reported that the submitted plan showed a new front entrance gate to be under 1 metre high but no details of what it would look like. If the event the recommendation was agreed there would be a new condition seeking details of the appearance of the new access gate for Officer approval prior to installation. Condition 2 need to be updated to incorporate a series of amended plans that had been submitted recently. The drawings removed 2 rooflights and those drawings needed to be approved. Condition 7 needed to be reworded, it required the existing vehicular access to be closed off. It was not clear on the details and the submitted drawing showed how the access would be closed off, and replaced by a grass verge to integrate with the remaining grass verge and a brick wall constructed to integrate with the existing brick wall. The Officer recommended that Condition 7 be amended to require the works as shown on the drawing to be done. The following drafting errors on the Officer's report were highlighted: 7.5.2 'given the nature of the proposed development including the demolition of the existing bungalow' they were not

proposing the demolition of the house. 7.7.2 referred to 'Heathside Close', should read 'Heathside Road'; 7.7.3 The proposed dwelling contained 6 bedrooms' should read '5 bedrooms'.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in favour of the application.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) Councillor Craige Coren, Batchworth Community Councillor spoke on the application.

Councillor Craige Coren said Batchworth Community Council had no desire to not allow this application but asked for more time to consider the revised drawing.

Councillor Debbie Morris highlighted the following points:

- The new vehicular access should not be overly wide.
- Clarification was required on what exactly was proposed in the soft landscaping scheme for the boundary treatment along the length and along the front. The inspector accepted a low wall being built but there was nothing about maintenance of boundary trees and hedges.
- Condition 3 Officers were only seeking samples of the bricks, but if other materials were changed could samples be provided?
- Clarification required on the design to the front. Could this be conditioned in terms of both hard and soft boundary treatment?

The planning Officer advised that Officers judged the width of the vehicular access not to be excessive but reasonable.

In terms of samples, the submitted drawings showed a grey stone effect block paving. As mentioned Condition 6 said no development should take place until there had been submitted to and approved in writing a scheme of hard and soft landscaping. They would make an addition for details of the front driveway material to be submitted for their consideration and approval. That would allow them to seek details of what soft landscaping would go in the site. So would cover the provision of and maintenance for at least 5 years of soft landscaping to the front boundary. Condition 5 would enable them to secure details of how the existing soft landscaping would be protected. Condition 3, the addition of windows and roof tiles could be included for their consideration.

Councillor Debbie Morris wanted to ensure that existing hedging was either retained or replaced with something similar. The Planning Officer said this would be covered by Condition 6.

Councillor Chris Lloyd if there were any further conditions required following the Batchworth Community Council's comments. The Planning Officers said that the additional comments that Moor Park 1958 raised. The new comments raised by the Conservation Officer had been circulated and Planning Officers had not changed their recommendation. They maintain that the proposal was acceptable. In terms of questions raised on the accuracy of the roof drawings. The Planning Officers overlaid the existing and proposed front, side and rear elevations and they did not show any changes to roof heights or roof pitches to the main house so considered that there was nothing further to clarify.

Councillor Raj Khiroya moved the recommendation plus the amendments discussed, duly seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd.

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

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the conditions set out in the report with the following additions:

- Update C2 to refer to most recent drawing numbers
- Update C3 to require details of roof tiles and windows to be submitted.
- Update C6 to require detail of the driveway surface to be included.
- New condition seeking details of the appearance of new access gate prior to installation
- Amend condition 7 to require the existing access to be removed as shown on the submitted site plan.

PC 98/21 21/2243/FUL - Single storey side extension to an existing outbuilding (Rangers unit) to include a larger seating area and a disability accessible toilet at CHORLEYWOOD LAWN CEMETERY, LADY ELLA DRIVE, CHORLEYWOOD, WD3 5TL

The Planning Officer advised of an update from the Conservation Officer that as this was an ancillary structure the proposed extension would not be out of keeping with its context so would not raise any objection.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) Parish Councillor Jon Bishop spoke on the application.

The Parish Councillor highlighted that would provide much needed disabled toilet.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved the recommendation, duly seconded by Councillor Alex Hayward.

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

RESOLVED:

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

PC99/21 21/2247/FUL – First floor front and rear extensions, loft conversion including increase in ridge height, dormer windows and rooflights, construction of front porch, alterations to external materials and alterations to fenestration at CRESTYL, DIMMOCKS LANE, SARRATT, WD3 6AR.

The Planning Officer had no updates.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in favour of the application.

The Planning Officer advised that this scheme had been previously refused and dismissed on appeal. The only difference between the last application was the granting of PDT (an Upward Extension Permitted Development prior approval application) as this was considered acceptable.

Councillor Alex Hayward asked what the material change was. The Planning Officer advised that it was the same scheme.

Councillor Margaret Hofman said there were no resident objections and the application was supported by the Parish Council. The Councillor asked if the drawings were inaccurate. The Planning Officer was unable to comment on the accuracy of the 3D drawings and said their assessment was based on the elevation of the drawings submitted. The Planning Officer reminded Members that there was a Green Belt consideration and to note there was a second reason as a result of the objection from Hertfordshire Ecology.

Councillor Alex Hayward confirmed that they had permission to build up but had chosen to build out and that had been previously refused.

Councillor Margaret Hofman said an issue of bats should not have anything to do with a Planning Application. The Planning Officer confirmed that this was a material consideration and was relevant and at this time it had not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on protected species.

Councillor Chris Lloyd suggested that the Applicant could re-submit if they went with the Officer recommendation and recommended that they do a pre-application to find out what was an acceptable option. Also to address the reason for refusal 2.

Councillor Debbie Morris asked whether Officers thought it would be a perverse decision and capable of challenge in the Courts by Herts Ecology if this was to be approved? The Planning Officer understood that in theory Hertfordshire Ecology could JR (Judicial Review) the application.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved the recommendation for refusal, duly seconded by Councillor Debbie Morris.

On being put to the Committee the recommendation to REFUSE planning permission was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 8 For, 2 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

PC100/21

21/2345/FUL: Part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear extensions, rear Juliet balcony, hip-to-gable roof extension and insertion of front rooflights at 65 Links Way, Croxley Green, WD3 3RH

The Planning Officer had no updates.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) Croxley Green Parish Councillor Andrew Gallagher spoke on this item.

The Councillor said the hip to gable conversion was not consistent with the Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan, or Three Rivers Development Management Policy. This application also included a sideways extension towards the neighbouring property and this combination would further unbalance the street scene. The Neighbourhood plan specifically included guidance on the adverse effect of lopsided roof extensions and Croxley Green Parish Council ask that this application be rejected as it did not respect the street scene or the character of the area.

The Planning Officer advised that all the issues raised had been addressed within the report.

Councillor Margaret Hofman understood there were houses with this design but agreed that this would be overbearing.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved the recommendation, duly seconded by Councillor Keith Martin.

On being put to the Committee, the recommendation was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 8 For 0 Against and 2 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

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

PC101/21

21/2383/FUL - Single storey side and rear extension, insertion of new rooflights, smooth white render, alterations to front door and external patio works at 90 KENILWORTH DRIVE, CROXLEY GREEN, WD3 3NW

The Planning Officer had no updates.

Councillor Keith Martin moved the recommendation, duly seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd.

On being put to the Committee, the recommendation was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 9 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

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

Councillor Chris Lloyd proposed a vote of thanks to Sherrie Ralton at her last Committee meeting.

Chair