



Edmund de Langley  
&  
Isabella de Castilla

# KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

## PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

**MINUTES of the Meeting held on Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> August 2017** at the Council Hall, Charter Court, Vicarage Lane, Kings Langley.

Present: Cllrs Anderson, Angiolini (Chair), Button, De Silva (Vice-Chair), Johnson and Rogers.

Also Present: Mrs Beverley Ross, Administrative Assistant; Cllr Collins

1. Apologies for Absence.

1.1 Cllr McLean

2. Declarations of Interest.

2.1 Cllr Collins declared Personal Interest as he lives near to 27-33 Hempstead Road, Planning Ref: 4/01845/17/MFA. Cllr Johnson declared Personal Interest as he knows the applicant of Planning Ref: 4/01232/17/FHA, Mr Tim Griffiths.

3. Public Participation / Question Time.

3.1 Mr Gavin Cooper was invited to speak regarding Planning Ref: 4/01845/17/MFA. Representing the applicant McCarthy and Stone, Mr Cooper stated that the development of retirement flats was a matter of concern against benefits and asked what was the harm? The benefits were that this type of development was needed in the village, that it encouraged downsizing and that living in a community such as a retirement development was healthier and so less demand would be put on the NHS. One concern was the scale of the development: the visual impact. However, the building would be 1m higher in the middle and the back 1.3m below the hedge, so would not dominate the back and there would be no impact. Another concern was parking. Studies had been carried out and concluded that 22 parking spaces were required but that 30 spaces would be provided. In their experience, many retired people gave up driving. If the parking area was full, it had been identified that 16 spaces were available in nearby roads - to which there was a muttering of disapproval. With ecology concerns, the area would be enhanced and improved and there were no concerns for wildlife.

3.2 Stewart Michell of 26 Hempstead Road was invited to speak. He said that many residents were opposed to this development which in his opinion was of poor design visually, crammed in and on a very busy road on which there had already been two fatalities. The access point would be difficult to exit as the trees were being retained, and was an accident waiting to happen. He thought that 60 residents could bring 60 cars and having just one space for visitors was ridiculous. If the application went ahead it would give precedent to further land grabbing and lead to the village becoming urbanised.



Edmund de Langley  
&  
Isabella de Castilla

# KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

## PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

- 3.3 Ms Fiona Herbert of 28 Hempstead Road stated that she wished to oppose the development as she felt the village and conservation area needed to be protected and the proposal did nothing to enhance the area. It would be overly developed and result in a loss of privacy for nearby residents. Another concern was for wildlife: bats, deer, badgers and owls were all in the vicinity. There were already five elderly people's developments in a ½ mile radius and any more would put increased pressure on local services. A recent public meeting of which 100 people or so had attended showed that people had had enough and she asked the council to stand up and protect the village for the future.
- 3.4 Mrs Cheryl Hall of 30 Hempstead Road voiced her concern about the scale and appearance of the development stating that it was bigger than the newly extended hotel nearby. She asked if the plans were up to date as she had noticed a discrepancy with the windows. Although the building was 1 metre higher, the living space at the top would mean people would be able to look down into her bedroom. There was also a discrepancy with the parking provision. According to her calculations of the formula used there should be 38 parking spaces and hoped that parking problems would be taken into consideration. With the volume of traffic on the road there was no safe way to get to the bus stop as the road bends before the Toby Carvery. The ecology survey didn't check roofs for bats known to be in the area, and the tree survey, which wasn't provided to Dacorum Borough Council until today, shows that not all trees will be retained.
- 3.5 The Chair then asked Cllr Anderson to speak. Cllr Anderson explained that the Parish Council was only asked for its opinion on planning matters and if it objected to an application the reasons had to be relevant and sustainable. He advised his colleagues to establish what impact the development would have on the character of the village and what would change. If the rear of the development was above the tree/vegetation line and would be detrimental to the conservation area then they can object if they wish. With regard to traffic and parking, Dacorum Borough Council could only take an objection from Hertfordshire County Council. Although there were homes for the elderly in the village, they were of different kinds. There were grounds for objection but expectations should be managed. He acknowledged that a lot of work had been put in by the applicant, adding that, in the autumn, there would be a consultation on a local plan and the village may be under more pressure of development on the green belt for example in Love Lane, the trout lake and Rectory Farm.
- 3.6 After a perusal of the plans by the Members, Cllr Angiolini announced that the Council had decided that it would object to the planning application on three grounds, summarised as follows:



Edmund de Langley  
&  
Isabella de Castilla

# KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

## PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

- That the proposed development would be higher than the existing buildings, and would be visible and have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area to the rear.
- Regardless of the reduction in the number of road traffic access points, the council also objects as the proposal would involve an increase in the amount of traffic movements on a busy road with a history of fatal Road Traffic Incidents. The applicant's claim that the type of accommodation would not require as much parking, meanwhile, is incompatible with the goal of providing independent living for pensioners.
- The council supports other objections which have referred to the impact on the character of the village, as there is no other residential accommodation in the village of this type and size. The proposal would therefore be out of keeping with the rest of the village, and is incompatible with the setting of a village.

3.7 Cllr Angiolini warned that if residents attended the meeting at Dacorum Borough Council and wished to speak, they would have to register and would be kept to a strict three minutes.

### 4. Minutes of Previous Meeting(s).

4.1 It was proposed, seconded and RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meetings held on 18<sup>th</sup> July and 1<sup>st</sup> August 2017 be adopted as a true record.

### 5. Matters Arising (not elsewhere on the agenda).

5.1 There were none.

### 6. Consideration of Planning Applications.

Reference No: 4/01845/17/MFA  
House & Road: 27-33, Hempstead Road  
Proposal: Demolition of Four Existing Dwellings. Redevelopment to Form 40 Units of Retirement Living (Category II Sheltered Housing) Apartments for the Elderly with Associated Communal Facilities, Parking and Landscaping  
Submission: OBJECTION as above.

Reference No: 4/01790/17/ROC  
House & Road: 9, Langley Hill  
Proposal: Variation of Condition 3 Attached to pp 4/03414/16/FHA - Two Storey Front Extension. Two Storey and Single Storey Side and Rear Extensions. Single Storey Side and Rear Extension with Roof Terrace. Loft Conversion with 5 Dormers. Detached Garage.  
Submission: NO OBJECTION



Edmund de Langley  
&  
Isabella de Castilla

# KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

## PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

Reference No: 4/01898/17/TPO  
House & Road: 9, Langley Hill  
Proposal: Works to Beech Tree  
Submission: NO OBJECTION

Reference No: 4/01232/17/FHA (AMENDED PLANS)  
House & Road: Cherry Cottage, Station Footpath  
Proposal: Loft Conversion including Alterations to Roof, Rear Dormer, Two Side Dormers and Side Roof Lights. Single Storey Side Extension  
Submission: NO OBJECTION

Reference No: 4/01926/17/TPO  
House & Road: 4, Barnsway  
Proposal: Works to Oak Tree  
Submission: NO OBJECTION

Reference No: 4/01957/17/LDP  
House & Road: 15, Langley Hill  
Proposal: Single Storey Rear Extension  
Submission: NO OBJECTION

Reference No: 4/01866/17/ROC  
House & Road: 33, Langley Hill  
Proposal: Variation of Conditions 3 and 6 Attached to pp 4/00828/15/FHA - Part Single, Part Two Storey Side and Rear Extension. Front Dormer Window and Rear Balcony  
Submission: NO OBJECTION

7. Planning Applications monthly update list.

7.1 The report was noted.

8. Other Matters.

8.1 None

9. Any Other Business (not requiring formal decision).

9.1 Cllr Button raised concerns about the recent traveller incursion on Chipperfield Common and suggested putting hitching rail around the common which would still allow access to walk onto the common. Cllr Anderson stated that he would support this but that it would be difficult to fence off all areas and locks could be forced to allow illegal entry and reported that the travellers were moved off quickly by the police. Cllr Angiolini said Dacorum Borough Council could be approached with the idea and Cllr Button asked that it be discussed at a full council meeting and that a



Edmund de Langley  
&  
Isabella de Castilla

# KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

## PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

plan of the common should be drawn. Cllr Anderson thought that communication should be opened first and wondered if it was financially viable as fences kept getting vandalised.

- 9.2 Cllr Johnson wanted to draw attention to a Watford Road resident that had had a planning application for road access refused had removed a wall was is using the neighbours kerb “let-down” to drive onto his driveway in breach of the planning decision. At 35 Rockcliffe Avenue, it would seem that the property was higher than stated on the plans and now looked directly into No. 37. Both matters had been referred to the Enforcement department.
- 9.3 Cllr Rogers asked that the signs for no parking on the grass verges be redone as the old ones were looking tatty.
- 9.4 Cllr Collins reported that the “birds mouth” fencing near the surgery that was broken had been removed and noted that the posts were in fact rotting.
- 9.5 It was agreed that the Football Club had done a very good job in protecting the grass verges during a recent big match with Hereford and had provided parking for the coaches in the laybys. A thank you letter would be sent to the football club.

Meeting Closed at 8:10pm