



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held on Tuesday 5th June 2018 at the Council Hall, Charter Court, Vicarage Lane, Kings Langley.

Present: Cllrs Angiolini (Chair), Button, De Silva and Rogers.

Also Present: Mr Paul Dunham, Clerk to the Council; Mr Jatinder Singh of Lanresse, Rucklers Lane.

1. Apologies for Absence.

1.1 Cllrs Anderson, Johnson and McLean.

2. Declarations of Interest.

2.1 None.

3. Public Participation / Question Time.

3.1 There were no members of the public present.

4. Consideration of Planning Applications.

Reference No: 4/01086/18/FUL
House & Road: Balls Pond Farm, Chipperfield Road
Proposal: Conversion of Existing Listed Barn into a Two Dwelling Houses
Submission: The Council NOTED this application.

Reference No: 4/01087/18/LBC
House & Road: Balls Pond Farm, Chipperfield Road
Proposal: Conversion of Existing Listed Barn into a Two Dwelling Houses
Submission: The Council NOTED this application.

Reference No: 4/01183/18/FUL
House & Road: 33, Watford Road
Proposal: Single Storey Rear and Two Storey Front Extension
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application.

Reference No: 4/01230/18/FHA
House & Road: 56, Vicarage Lane
Proposal: First Floor Rear Extension
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application.



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

Reference No: 4/00918/18/FHA
House & Road: 1, Kings Meadow
Proposal: Two Storey Side Extension
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application.

Reference No: 4/00436/18/OUT (AMENDED)
House & Road: 1, The Orchard
Proposal: Demolition of Existing Bungalow and Garage. Replace with Four Two-Bed Dwellings
Submission: The Council OBJECTED to this planning application on the grounds that by virtue of its size / bulk it would result in a serious over-cramping of the site, be out-of-keeping with neighbouring properties and exacerbate problems with parking and access, in particular with access for emergency vehicles.

Reference No: 4/01268/18/LDP
House & Road: St Mary's Vicarage, Shendish
Proposal: Side Extension Over Existing Hard Standing
Submission: The Council had NO OBJECTION to this application.

Reference No: 4/00040/18/FUL (AMENDED)
House & Road: 40, Coniston Road
Proposal: Single-Storey Side Extensions and Part Two Part Single-Storey Rear Extension Following Demolition of Existing Garage, Hip-To-Gable Loft Conversion, Alterations to Front Openings and Conversion of Existing Building to Create Two Separate Dwellings
Submission: The Council OBJECTED to this application because its bulk / size would not be in-keeping with neighbouring properties / the street and would create a visual intrusion and cause a loss of light to neighbouring properties, and further, that the latest design, especially the removal of the chimneys, would destroy the character of the building and damage the character of the street.

5. Other Matters.

5.1 Dacorum Borough Council

5.1.1 4/00624/18/FHA - Lanresse, Rucklers Lane. The Council had received an email from Dacorum Borough Council's Case Officer for this application asking if the Committee would reconsider its previous submission.

5.1.1.1 At its meeting on 2nd March 2018, "the Council OBJECTED to this application because it is too large a development for the site; added to the previous development, this would constitute an increase of 134% in the Green Belt."



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

5.1.1.2 Mr Singh, the applicant, was given the opportunity to speak to this item. His main planning related arguments were that:

- a. his application would mean an increase less than that which would be allowed under permitted development
- b. the ridge height and distance from the highway would remain the same, as the intention is mainly in-filling
- c. the design is the same as neighbouring properties
- d. there would be minimal disruption to the openness of the Green Belt.

5.1.1.3 Whilst the Members understood the arguments, including that of the possible level of construction under permitted development, it decided to up-hold its previous submission to object to the application. The committee felt that for the following (additionally detailed) reasons, the application should be referred to the Development Management Committee:

- a. If the applicant could develop the same or more floorspace through permitted development rights, why is the applicant having to apply for planning permission? Moreover, this is not a material planning consideration.
- b. The massive increase in the amount of floorspace in the Green Belt remains incontrovertibly grounds for refusal - this proposal would take the increase to about 275%, which goes far way and beyond the 133% or relaxed 183% permitted in the Green Belt.
- c. The limit for extensions in the Green Belt applies, regardless of the impact on the Openness of the Green Belt
- d. The proposal would impact the Openness of the Green Belt anyway, as it would reduce the gap between the existing property and the woodland to the South.
- e. Breaching the limit for additional floorspace in the Green Belt would be fundamentally unfair on all the other applicants who have had planning permission refused.
- f. The limit for extra floorspace in the Green Belt applies to the property, not the applicant - that the applicant hasn't previously extended the property is and should be irrelevant.

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

6.1 None.

Meeting Closed at 7:51pm