

---

**PLANNING COMMITTEE****MINUTES**

Of a Planning Committee meeting held in the Penn Chamber at Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, on Thursday 25 May 2023 from 7.30pm to 9.02pm.

Councillors present:

Sara Bedford (Chair)	David Raw
Steve Drury (Vice Chair)	Khalid Hussain
Matthew Bedford	Debbie Morris
Ruth Clark	Ian Morris
Philip Hearn	
Sarah Nelmes (for Cllr Chris Lloyd)	
Stephen King	

Also in attendance:

Batchworth Community Councillor Craige Coren, Chorleywood Parish Councillor Jon Bishop

Officers: Claire Westwood, Tom Norris, Lauren Edwards & Sarah Haythorpe

**COUNCILLOR SARA BEDFORD IN THE CHAIR****PC 01/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Chris Lloyd with the named substitute being Councillor Sarah Nelmes.

**PC 02/23 MINUTES**

The minutes from the Planning Committee Meeting held on 20 April 2023 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair.

**PC 03/23 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS**

There was none.

**PC 04/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chair read out the following statement to the Committee:

All fellow Councillors should come to the Committee meeting with an open mind and be able to demonstrate that they have not pre-determined our decision in any way. We must only reach a decision after consideration of all the information provided by the officers, applicants, members of the public and other Councillors and the planning policies of the Council and should not do anything which may lead others to believe that we have already made up our minds as to whether to approve or refuse an application.

Councillor Debbie Morris declared a non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 5 (22/1621FUL – Partial demolition of existing dwelling and construction of basement, two storey rear extension, two storey side extension, loft conversion including rear dormers and rooflights, construction of chimney and alterations to fenestration at 36 MAIN AVENUE, MOOR PARK, HERTS, HA6 2LQ) as the Councillor had spoken against the application as a Member outside the Committee and would leave room for the debate.

Councillor Debbie Morris left the meeting.

**PC 05/23**

**22/1621/FUL – Partial demolition of existing dwelling and construction of basement, two storey rear extension, two storey side extension, loft conversion including rear dormers and rooflights, construction of chimney and alterations to fenestration at 36 MAIN AVENUE, MOOR PARK, HERTS, HA6 2LQ**

The Planning Officer reported that there was no update.

Batchworth Community Council noted the information provided in the interim period. They had raised concerns on this and the previous applications with regard to scale, height, the negative impact of the side extension, ridge height, the extensive development of the site, and the extensive demolition of a 1930s property in the Conservation Area leaving very little of the original property. The development is detrimental to the Conservation Area and key features were being lost and there would be extensive increase in the depth and width of the house.

Members of the Committee raised the following points:

Would the chimney be retained? If it was could Condition 4 which related to the construction and demolition statement include the chimney.

Could see no reason for refusal. Would be sufficient gaps between properties having looked at the plan with the west side looking the same and to the east larger due to the removal the existing single storey building.

Why was it now considered that reason for refusal R1 had been overcome.

The Planning Officer advised that the existing single storey garage was proposed to be removed. There would be the introduction of a 1<sup>st</sup> floor element to the side, but this would be less than what was currently there. In the officer's view there was sufficient evidence that the reasons for refusal had been overcome. With regard to the chimney this could be included within Condition 4.

Councillor Matthew Bedford moved that the recommendation that planning permission be granted with the conditions and informatives as set out in the officer report, and to include an amendment to Condition 4 to include specific reference to the retention of the existing chimney, seconded by Councillor Sarah Nelmes.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 10 For, 0 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED (in accordance with the officer recommendation) with amendment to Condition C4 to include specific reference to retention of existing chimney.

Amended Condition C4 to read:

*No development or other operation shall commence on site whatsoever until a Construction & Demolition Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This Construction & Demolition Method Statement shall include details of how all existing walls (internally and externally), roofslopes and chimney as shown on drawing numbers 5678 /PL003 Rev B and 5678 /PL004 Rev C to be retained (i.e. hatched in grey (marked as existing)) will be maintained in situ throughout the erection of the extensions hereby permitted with only those walls and roofslopes shown on the abovementioned drawings as proposed for demolition (as shown dashed in orange) to be removed.*

*The extent of demolition hereby approved shall not be implemented until a contract for the implementation of the works of redevelopment of the site (including submission of the construction drawings) has been made and a copy submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.*

Councillor Debbie Morris returned to the meeting.

**PC 06/23**

**23/0089/FUL - Substantial demolition of existing dwelling and construction of part-single storey, part-two storey side and rear extensions, single storey front and side extensions; relocation of entrance door and rear Juliet balconies and terrace balconies; alterations to roof including increase in ridge height; front rooflight; alterations to the frontage, extension and alterations to rear patio and construction of swimming pool; internal alterations and alterations to fenestration at 5 ROSS WAY, NORTHWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE, HA6 3HU**

The Planning Officer reported that there was no update.

Batchworth Community Council said they had previously set out their concerns and objections. They did not feel the revised application significantly changed anything and felt it was overdevelopment of a small site. The extension of the property would make the dwelling 70% of the plot and wondered if it could be scaled down. They had concerns about construction traffic entering the site, which was in a cul-de-sac location, and the traffic flow. Neighbours had raised concerns on access, design and the use of the elevation. They referred to the landscape report and the removal of trees and shrubs and waste removal from the site.

It was advised that Condition 6 covered construction access to the site and the Highways Authority had not objected to the change of access.

A Member asked with regard to Condition 6 – Construction Management Plan – could this be extended for the whole duration of the project to enable continued access to the road and to stop vehicles parking on the pavement.

The Planning Officer advised that this could be added to Condition 6 for the whole duration of the works. There would clearly be a need to export a lot of

soil due to the construction of the swimming pool and the wording of the condition could be more detailed if Members wished.

Councillor Steve Drury moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen King, that Planning Permission be Granted (in accordance with the officer recommendation with the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report) with an amendment to Condition 6 to require full Construction Management Plan (CMP) for all works.

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

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED (in accordance with the officer's recommendation) with amendment to Condition C6 to require full Construction Management Plan (CMP) for all works.

Amended Condition C6 to read:

*Works to construct the swimming pool, hereby permitted, shall not begin until full details of construction vehicle access, movements, collection hours, on-site parking arrangements for construction workers and wheel washing facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details shall be submitted in the form of a Construction Management Plan and the approved details shall be implemented throughout the construction programme.*

**The correct wording for Condition 6 (as included on the Decision Notice) should be:**

*No development shall take place, including any works of demolition and the swimming pool hereby permitted, 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. construction of 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*
- vi. wheel washing facilities*
- vii. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction*
- viii. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works*

*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).*

**PC 07/23      23/0099/LBC - Listed Building Consent: Installation of internal lift at THE OLD VICARAGE, 10 CHURCH STREET, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 1BS**

The Planning Officer reported that there was no update.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(B) point (e) the Chair used their discretion to allow the applicant to speak again on the application as there was updated information to provide to the Committee since the application was last considered.

Members made the following points:

If the lift is in the new part of the dwelling, would they be able to have access to the landing area.

If the lift was installed in the historical part of the building it would cause harm to the listed building.

What was the age of the beams were they Victorian or older.

What was the age of the staircase.

In response to the Member questions, the Planning Officer advised that the plan the applicant had alluded to was the 1990s extension which was on the right hand side of the lift. The proposed location of the lift was on the left-hand side of the lift in the historical part of the building. They did not know the exact age of the beams in question but looked around the 18/19<sup>th</sup> century and were part of the listed building. The applicant proposed to replace the timbers that needed to be removed with ones of a similar age. It was believed that the staircase was part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century part of building. Officers did not feel the proposal was acceptable for approval and it was not possible to ask the applicant to put back the timbers that were removed.

Councillor Matthew Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen King that Planning Permission be Refused (in accordance with the officer's recommendation).

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED the voting being 5 For, 4 Against and 2 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be REFUSED (in accordance with the officer's recommendation)

**PC 08/23      23/0387/FUL - Change of use of woodland land into residential garden with timber fencing for the three properties (15, 17 & 19 Woodland Chase) at LAND ADJACENT TO 15, 17 AND 19 WOODLAND CHASE, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 3FN**

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the application to extend their garden into the woodland area and a member of the Croxley Green Residents Association spoke against the application and thought there should be special circumstances to move the boundary into the woodlands.

The Planning Officer advised that the 2012 permission applied to the developer whilst the development was ongoing, and it was not possible to reduce/amend the scheme and would require separate discussions to this application.

Members made the following points:

Were not happy with the proposal in the application and extending the boundaries and wished the woodlands to be retained.

Was the site a local wildlife site.

Concern around the impact of the designation change adversely affecting the adjacent local wildlife site.

What happens if planning permission was granted would the applicant have the right to build sheds on the land and would this involve the removal of trees and bushes?

The Croxley Green Residents Association had said the area was used by residents and the Parish Council preserve the area to make it usable. Would the residents still be able to use the area.

The application was just requesting to use part of the area in a different way and could not see lawns appearing. It would mean the fence would be moved but they were not asking for additional features.

The Planning Officer advised the site was adjacent to a local wildlife site. It would be possible to control any building under permitted development rights. It was possible, if members were minded, to remove permitted development regarding Class E buildings and any fencing around the parameters of the site. The application site and surrounding woodland is covered by a woodland Tree Preservation, and this would include both shrubs and trees. Noted it was not Green Belt woodland and there was already housing development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 7.1.11 provided details on the existing land which is not enclosed at present and is spatially open and appeared visually open. There had been a landscape objection due to the loss of the woodlands. There could be further requests on the land if in private ownership but would be protected as part of the woodland order but they could apply to fell or lop a tree. The officers reasons for refusal were set out in the report.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes said one the key issues was the introduction of a 6ft close boarded fence around the woodland. The Councillor moved, seconded by Councillor Matthew Bedford, that Planning Permission be Refused in accordance with the officer recommendation.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 10 For, 1 Against and 0 Abstentions

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED (in accordance with the officer's recommendation)

The meeting was adjourned for a few minutes to check the livestreaming.

**PC 09/23**

**23/0427/FUL – Two storey front, side and rear extensions and loft conversion including roof extensions, insertion of roof lights at 10 GROSVENOR ROAD, NORTHWOOD, HA6 3HJ**

Under Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the application emphasising that amended plans had taken into account the concerns raised and a member of the public spoke against highlighting the appeal decision and the land widths which the Inspector had raised and that the application should be within design policies.

Batchworth Community Council raised concern and did not feel the amendments changed the opinions raised by the Inspector and overcome the concerns raised. They would like the applicant to seek a better solution.

Members raised the following points:

The depth of the flanks, the crown roof, design, were contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12, and should be considered and did not feel the reasons for refusal had been overcome.

The reason for refusal last time was not part of the Appeal Inspector decision.

The design is not good, but it is not in a Conservation Area and it makes it difficult to refuse. Amendments had been made and they could not see a reason for refusal on design.

Streetscene was still a key issue and the impact it would have, its bulk and the lack of significant articulation, along with the crown roof and multiple roof lights.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved refusal, seconded by Councillor David Raw based on the impact on the streetscene, and excessive bulk and massing of the resultant dwelling. Other reasons for refusal raised for consideration were the effect on the streetscene, excessive bulk/dominance, massing, impact on character, roof lights, crown roof and the glazing had not been reduced.

The Planning Officer advised that following the motion to propose to refuse planning permission the details of the refusal were on the grounds of unacceptable impact of the extensions on the character of the streetscene resulting from the excessive bulk and massing of the resultant dwelling. The exact wording to be circulated to members. Offices considered the articulation, rooflights and glazing had been addressed.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Permission be REFUSED (contrary to officer's recommendation) on grounds of an unacceptable impact of the extensions on the character of the streetscene resulting from the excessive bulk and massing of the resultant dwelling. The exact reason for refusal to be circulated to members.

Wording of Reason for Refusal:

*By virtue of the overall scale of the proposed extensions and overall increase in the depth of the flanks, which lack any significant levels of articulation to alleviate their unduly rectilinear appearance, the resultant dwelling would have an overall bulk and massing which would appear as an unduly prominent and visually obtrusive form of development to the detriment of the character of the streetscene. The design of the glazing within the front elevation would also exacerbate the prominence of the extensions by virtue of its jarring relationship with the existing bay feature. The proposed development would result in the host dwelling appearing unduly prominent within the site and street scene and would be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013).*

**PC 10/23      23/0449/FUL - Construction of part single, part two storey side and rear extension; loft conversion including rear dormer and front rooflights; relocation of entrance door and removal of chimney breast; internal alterations, at 5 POPES ROAD, ABBOTS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD5 0DQ**

The Planning Officer had no updates.

Members made the following points:

Where the proposed wall would be located would not be acceptable on the neighbour.

Would support adding additional reason for refusal on the wall being unneighbourly on the neighbour.

Thought the 0.5 metre gap between the two properties would be unneighbourly.

The Planning Officer advised that Reason for Refusal R2 could be amended if Members were minded to include that the proposed 2 storey extension due to its proximity to the flank boundary would result in an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development on No.7 Popes Road resulting in the loss of light to the two first floor flank windows. The 0.5 metre gap between the two properties could not be a planning reason for refusal.

Councillor Matthew Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Sarah Nelmes that planning permission be refused on the grounds set out in the officer report with an amendment to Reason R2 as set out by the officer.

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

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be Refused (in accordance with the officer's recommendation) with amendment to R2 to include that; "The proposed two storey side extension due to its proximity to the flank boundary would result in an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development as experienced by



the occupiers of No. 7 Popes Road, resulting in loss of light to the two first floor flank windows.

Amended Reason R2 to read:

*The proposed development would introduce two large first floor rear bedroom windows in close proximity of the boundary with No. 3 Popes Road that would afford direct views into the private amenity space of the neighbour, to the detriment of the residential amenities of occupiers of this property. The proposed two storey side extension due to its proximity to the flank boundary would result in an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development as experienced by the occupiers of No. 7 Popes Road, resulting in loss of light to the two first floor flank windows. The development would be 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).*

**PC 11/23**

**23/0577/RSP – Retrospective: Retention of temporary access track for construction vehicles to facilitate developments at Bullsland Farm for a further temporary period at BULLSLAND FARM, BULLSLAND LANE, CHORLEYWOOD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 5BG**

The Planning Officer referred to Paragraph 1.1.9 of the report and advised that with regard to application 23/0542 this had been permitted today but had no material impact on this scheme.

Chorleywood Parish Council said there had been temporary access for 3 years and applicant was now now requested a further extension of the use of that temporary access for 3 years. They did not consider this to be reasonable and suggested 12 months with Condition 2 to be amended.

Members of the Committee made the following points:

Would be a lot of work for just 1 year to enable access for construction traffic and felt they could come back with a further application. 1 and half years would be more reasonable and allowed time for the work to be completed and the track removed.

Condition 3 controlled the use of the access track and the timings to access the development for deliveries.

The Planning Officer advised that a period of 12 months was a reasonable time and the applicant had considered this would provide sufficient time. Condition 3 required the applicant to submit a Construction Management Plan.

Councillor Matthew Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Debbie Morris that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED the voting being 10 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.

**RESOLVED:**

That Planning Permission be GRANTED (in accordance with the officer's recommendation)

**CHAIR**