

## THREE RIVERS DISTRICT COUNCIL

**At a meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on Thursday, 19 October 2023 from 7.30 - 9.25 pm**

**Present:** Councillors Councillor Sara Bedford (Chair), Councillor Steve Drury (Vice-Chair), Ruth Clark, Matthew Bedford, Philip Hearn, Stephen King, Chris Lloyd, Debbie Morris and Khalid Hussain

**Also in Attendance:** Councillors Reena Ranger and Chris Whatley-Smith

**Officers in Attendance:**

Matthew Barnes, Solicitor

Lauren Edwards, Planning Officer

Adam Ralton, Development Management Team Leader

Kimberley Rowley, Head of Regulatory Services

Claire Westwood, Development Management Team Leader

### **PC1/23            APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ian Morris and David Raw.

### **PC2/23            MINUTES**

It was noted, that due to resource constraints, the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2023 had not yet been finalised and would be brought to the Committee's next meeting for approval.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 17<sup>th</sup> August be agreed as being a correct record and are signed by the Chair.

### **PC3/23            DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

On behalf of the Committee's Liberal Democrat Councillors, the Chair made a group declaration in respect of Item 13, 23/1481/RSP 21 Bateson Drive as the agent for the application was a Liberal Democrat Councillor.

### **PC4/23            NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS**

There were no items of other business.

### **PC5/23            23/0698/FUL - 9 RUSSELL ROAD, MOOR PARK, NORTHWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE, HA6 2LJ.**

The application was for the construction of a single storey front extension and part single, part two storey side and rear extension, basement and front porch extension, and loft extension following demolition of the existing conservatory. The application had been called in by Batchworth Community Council who had cited concerns in respect of over development and the scale of the proposed extensions.

Representatives of Batchworth Community Council , Moor Park (1958) Ltd and Ward Councillor Reena Ranger spoke against the proposals. Concerns were expressed about the fact the proposed development was out of scale with the surrounding area and did not meet the guidelines set out in the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal. Furthermore, it was considered that allowing the application would be detrimental to the openness of the area's character and would result the slow erosion of conservation policies.

The Committee was informed that further comments had been received from Moor Park 1958 Ltd objecting to the development, specifically in relation to plot coverage. In addition, the proposed elevations had been corrected to accurately depict the ridgeline of the 2013 consented scheme and therefore conditions 2 and 4 had been updated to refer to plan reference 3K rather than the 3J stated in the report. Details of the paving materials to be used on the sunken garden were awaited however these would include a stone retaining wall that matched the house. Condition 5(Materials) could be updated to include specific reference if the Committee considered it appropriate.

It was confirmed that the proposed development would result in a frontage that was 80% of the plot width and 1.5m from the boundary and was compliant with limits set out in planning guidance. It was acknowledged that whilst the proposed development would exceed the 15% plot coverage set out in the conservation area appraisal the bulk of the extensions would be to the rear of the property and it was considered that substantial harm would not be caused to the spacious open nature of the conservation area.

It was agreed that Condition 5 would be updated to include details of the materials that would be used for the construction of the sunken garden.

The officer recommendation to approve the application, subject to the amendments set out above was proposed by Councillor Matthew Bedford, seconded by Councillor Steve Drury, put to the vote and carried.

The voting in respect of the recommendations was For 6, Against 2 and Abstaining 1.

**RESOLVED** that Planning Application 23/0698/FUL be approved.

NOTE – Amended Conditions 2, 4 and 5:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 5182/PL001/Rev I, 5182/PL002/REV N, 5182/PL003/REV K, 5182/PL/005 REV E and 5182/PL/LP REV B.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning and to safeguard the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policies CP1, CP9, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policies DM1, DM3, DM6, DM8, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2006).

Before the first use of the ground floor level patio hereby permitted, timber close-boarded screening (or a similar solid screen) to a height of 1.8 metres shall be installed along the depth of the patio as shown on approved plans 5182/PL001 Rev I and 5182/PL003 Rev K. Once erected, the screening shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter in terms of its siting, height and design.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of No. 7 and No. 11 Russell 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).

Before any building operations above ground level hereby permitted are commenced, a schedule of samples and details of the proposed external materials (inclusive but not limited to the Mock Tudor detailing, roof tiles, windows and doors, bricks and render, sunken garden, retaining walls and paving) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no external materials shall be used other than those approved.

Reason: To prevent the building being constructed in inappropriate materials in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policies DM1, DM3 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2006).

**PC6/23            23/0699/AOD – LAND TO SOUTH OF FOXGROVE PATH/HEYSHAM DRIVE,  
SOUTH OXHEY, WATFORD, WD19 6YL**

The application was for the approval of details of appearance, landscaping, layout in respect of a Planning Application 19/2419/OUT a residential development of 53 dwellings, construction of parking spaces, associated landscaping, infrastructure works and ancillary work which had been granted outline planning permission in May 2020.

The Committee was informed that the range of amenity space shortfall referenced at paragraph 7.5.11 of the Officer's report should have been quoted as 0.8sqm to 29sqm and not the 0.8sqm to 22sqm range stated. An amended Soft Landscape Management Plan, referenced in Condition 13, had now been submitted.

A representative of Watford Community Housing, spoke in support of the application.

The Committee welcomed the proposed scheme. In response to concerns about the potential safety of the proposed pond, it was clarified that the pond would form part of the site's drainage solution, which had been approved as part of the Outline Planning Application, and would only hold water at times of very heavy rain. As such it was not intended to be a permanently wet feature and a 0.5m high timber fence was considered to be an appropriate boundary treatment in this instance. It was felt that a higher timber surround would detract from the openness of the site's design. It was confirmed that the play area would be surrounded by a 1.2m high railing fence.

It was confirmed that a Condition had been included in the Outline Planning Permission that the six parking spaces at the entrance of the development site would be provided and available for use before the work on the development proper commenced.

The Officer recommendation to approve the application, subject to the conditions set out in the Officers report, was proposed by Councillor Steve Drury, seconded by Councillor Stephen King, put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that Planning Application 23/0699/AOD be approved, with an alteration to Condition 13 to reflect the revised Landscape Management Plan (Revision C).

**PC7/23            23/0701/FUL – LAND TO SOUTH OF FOXGROVE PATH/HEYSHAM DRIVE,  
SOUTH OXHEY, WATFORD, WD19 6YL**

The application was for the variation of Condition 4 (Affordable Housing), Condition 5 (Specification of Access) and Condition 7 (Bus stop and crossing works) attached to Outline Planning Permission 19/2419/OUT which had been approved in May 2020.

It was confirmed that the application sought to amend the level of affordable housing provision on the development from 45% previously approved to 100%. Although this would not be fully compliant with policy, it was considered that the benefits that the scheme would bring in terms

of 100% affordable housing, the deliverability of the scheme and the fall-back position would outweigh the scheme's non-compliance. The Committee was also advised that the applicant had confirmed that Homes England funding for the development had been secured.

Clarification was sought that whilst technically non-compliant with policy it was understood that the scheme achieved an overall increase in shared ownership units. This understanding was confirmed as being correct.

The Officer recommendation to grant the application, subject to the conditions set out in the report, was proposed by Councillor Matthew Bedford, seconded by Councillor Steve Drury, put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that Planning Application 23/0701/FUL be approved.

**PC8/23            23/1043/FUL - ARDEN HOUSE, 31 UPPER HIGHWAY, ABBOTS LANGLEY,  
HERTFORDSHIRE, WD4 8PP**

The application was for the construction of a part single, part two storey rear extension (roof accommodation) and alterations and additions to fenestration and rooflights to create additional bedrooms and office space at an existing care home. Consideration of the application had been deferred by the Planning Committee at its meeting in September 2023 to enable a site visit to take place.

Councillor Whatley-Smith spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor citing concerns about the lack of parking provision on the site.

The Committee considered that the picket fence proposed was out of keeping with the surrounding area. It was acknowledged that boundary treatments could be secured through conditions if necessary.

The Committee acknowledged that the current parking provision was insufficient for the needs of the business operating on site, with staff being forced to park in the surrounding streets, adding to local congestion and whilst it was proposed that an additional five parking spaces were provided as part of the application there would still be a shortfall of ten spaces on the number required for a facility of its size.

The Committee expressed the view that the original property had been subject to a number of extensions over the years and that, if granted, the additional extensions would result in a built form that dominated not only the site itself but also, due to the site's topography, neighbouring properties. The extensions would also enable the expansion of the occupier's business as a care home; something that would result in an intensification of the site's use and further exacerbate parking pressures in the vicinity of the site.

It was felt that all these factors combined would result in harm to the visual amenity of the character of the area and consequently it was considered that the application should be refused.

Councillor Sara Bedford, proposed a motion that the application should be refused on the grounds of over development of the plot, intensification of use, highways concerns, lack of onsite parking and the resultant cumulative impact on the visual amenity of the area. The motion was seconded by Councillor Matthew Bedford, put to the vote and carried unanimously. It was agreed that the final wording of the refusal notice would be circulated to the Committee for approval.

**RESOLVED** that Planning Application 23/1043/FUL be refused, contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

NOTE - Wording of Reason for Refusal

The proposed extension by virtue of its ad hoc nature, siting, proximity to rear boundary and elevated positioning relative to the neighbouring properties to the west would, together with the existing extent of built form, result in the overdevelopment and over intensive use of the site, to the detriment of the character of the area and amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The overdevelopment of the site is further exacerbated by the increased parking shortfall which would lead to parking on the adjacent highway, to the detriment of the safe movement and free flow of other highway users. The development is therefore contrary to Policies CP1, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

**PC9/23        23/1139/FUL – RICKMANSWORTH AQUADROME, RIVERSIDE DRIVE,  
RICKMANSWORTH**

The application was for the replacement of the existing pedestrian bridge over the River Colne with a new pedestrian and cycle bridge, including upgraded footpaths, fencing and seating areas. The application had been brought to the Committee for consideration as the District Council was the applicant.

It was noted that Condition 3 set out requirements in respect of the impact of construction traffic on the area. In order to ameliorate the concerns of residents it was agreed that an additional Condition requesting a construction management plan setting out access routes and times of work would be incorporated into the application.

It was acknowledged that the immediate vicinity of the site was used as nesting area and it was agreed that an Informative, requiring due care to be taken of bird nesting season and habitats, would be added to the application.

It was agreed that an additional Informative requiring the applicant to display appropriate diversion signs in the surrounding area including on noticeboards would be added to the application.

Concern about damage to trees was noted and officers confirmed that there would be some work to trees and mitigations would be secured through condition.

The Officer recommendation to approve the application, subject to the additional Condition and Informatives set out above, was proposed by Councillor Steve Drury, seconded by Councillor Debbie Morris, put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that Planning Application 23/1139/FUL be approved.

NOTE - The additional condition and informatives were as follows:

No development shall take place, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Statement shall provide for:

- i. parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- ii. access arrangements including the routing of vehicles
- iii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
- iv. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- v. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

Reason: This condition is a pre commencement condition in the interests of highway safety and convenience in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP10 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM10 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

It is requested that the applicant ensures that appropriate diversion signage is in place, including on notice boards near the site, prior to the commencement of any works and that these are maintained for the duration of works and updated as required.

Construction activities should take account of bird nesting season (1 March - 31 August inclusive).

**PC10/23      23/1328/FUL - SHAFTESBURY COURT, MALVERN WAY, CROXLEY GREEN, HERTFORDSHIRE**

It was noted that Planning Application 23/1328/FUL had been withdrawn by the applicant.

**PC11/23      23/1372/FUL – 32 OAK GREEN, ABBOTS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD5 0PG.**

The application was for the construction of a part single, part two storey front and side extensions. The application had been called in by three members of the Planning Committee due to concerns over the size of the extension and lack of parking.

It was confirmed that amenity space standards were 63sqm for a two bedroom property and 84square metres for a three bed roomed property. If approved there would be an approximate shortfall in amenity space of 19square metres. The Committee expressed concern that whilst the property would remain as a two bedroomed property the design could lend itself to conversion to a three bedroomed property. In addition, it was felt that the proposed development would lead to over-development of the plot and the design would leave the property looking out of character with the surrounding area, because it would be a prominent two storey building. It was noted that there was limited onsite parking in the vicinity of the property and there were parking problems in the area including turning heads due to demand and the development could place further pressures on parking provision.

Councillor Debbie Morris, proposed that the application be refused for reasons that it would lead to a cramped, over developed site that had a potential shortfall in amenity space and parking provision. The motion was seconded by Councillor Matthew Bedford, put to the vote and carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED** that Planning Application 23/1372/FUL be refused, contrary to the officer's recommendation.

NOTE - Wording of Reason for Refusal

The proposed development by reason of its height, width, depth, proximity to the boundary and siting at the end of the cul-de-sac would appear as a cramped and overly prominent overdevelopment of the site, exacerbated by the potential shortfall in amenity space, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and contrary to 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 proposed development has the potential to result in an increased shortfall of parking provision to serve the dwelling which would be likely to result in an increase in parking outside of the application site to the detriment of the safe movement and free flow of other highway users. The development is therefore contrary to Policies CP1, CP10 and CP12 of the Core

Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

**PC12/23      23/1425/FUL – BARFORD, HOMEFIELD ROAD, CHORLEYWOOD,  
RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 5QJ.**

The application was for the conversion of a garage into habitable accommodation and alterations to fenestration. The application had been called in to enable consideration of the consistency of the application with Condition 10 of the original application for the dwelling planning Application reference 16/2753/FUL) which had been imposed in order to maintain an acceptable level of parking across the development.

A local resident spoke against the application, expressing concern that the application was in apparent breach of the original planning application and the owner spoke in support of the application.

It was clarified that the planning permission for the original development had stated that two parking spaces were to be provided, one on hardstanding outside the property, and a second in the integrated garage. In 2022, planning permission had been granted to expand the external parking area to enable a second parking space to be provided, taking the dwelling's total parking provision to three spaces. If the application was granted there would still be two parking spaces at the property taking provision back in-line with the original application.

The Committee acknowledged the frustrations of long standing residents however it was felt that there was little harm in the application. Concern about the side windows not making use of obscure glass were noted however officers did not consider obscure glass to be necessary considering the room's intended use as a utility room.

The Officer recommendation to approve the application was proposed by Councillors Chris Lloyd, seconded by Councillor Matthew Bedford, put to the vote and passed. The voting in respect of the motion was For: 7, Against 0, Abstaining 2.

**RESOLVED** that Planning Application 23/1425/FUL be approved.

**PC13/23      23/1481/RSP – 21 BATESON DRIVE, LEAVESDEN, WATFORD,  
HERTFORDSHIRE, WD25 7ND**

The application was a part retrospective application for the construction of a rear conservatory and conversion of garage into habitable accommodation and driveway extension. The application had been referred to the Committee as the applicant was a District Councillor.

It was confirmed that updated plans showing the provision of parking had now been received, although these did not present a material change to the applications.

The Officer recommendation that part retrospective planning permission be granted was proposed by Councillor Matthew Bedford, seconded by Councillor Stephen King, put to the vote and carried. The vote in respect of the recommendation was For 8, Against 0 and Abstain 1.

**RESOLVED** that Planning Application 23/1481/RSP be approved.

**CHAIRMAN**