



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held “virtually” at 7:30pm on Tuesday 20th July 2021.

Present: Cllrs Anderson, Angiolini (Chair), Button, Johnson and McLean.

Also Present: Mr Paul Dunham, Clerk to the Council; Cllrs Collins and Sinclair.

1. Apologies for Absence.

1.1 Cllrs De Silva and Rogers.

2. Declarations of Interest.

2.1 Cllr Button declared a Personal Interest in application 21/02509/FUL (34 High Street) as he is related to the applicant, and 21/02669/FUL (Gaywoods Fishery) as he knows the applicant. All Members declared a Personal Interest in application 21/02601/LBC (84 Waterside) as they know the applicant.

3. Public Participation / Question Time.

3.1 None.

4. Minutes of Previous Meeting(s).

4.1 It was proposed, seconded and RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meetings held on 15th June and 6th July 2021 be adopted as a true record.

4.2 The Chair then signed the minutes.

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

5.1 Members noted the Borough’s decisions regarding applications for 1 The Orchard to which the Parish Council had objected (see minutes of 6th July 2021).

6. Consideration of Planning Applications.

Reference	Address	Details of Application	Submission	Reason (if any)
21/02632/FHA	66 Alexandra Road	Part single/part two storey extension	Objection	See below

The Parish Council objects to application 21/02632/FHA on the following material considerations:



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

1. The lack of parking provided in a cul-de-sac for such a significant development on a restricted site. This will have a major impact on traffic safety. For those unfamiliar with Alexandra road, there is parking on drives (where available), at kerb sides and, in some places, fully on the pavement.
2. The layout of the proposed development and its density in relation to the site itself are inappropriate and out-of-keeping with neighbouring properties.
3. The design and appearance of the proposed development is inappropriate for this part of the village.
4. There will be substantial loss of privacy for neighbours to the side and to the rear by a two-storey building which will dwarf its neighbours.
5. By the same token, there will be a loss of light for neighbours, who will find themselves overlooked to a very marked degree.

21/02669/FUL	Gaywoods Fishery, Station Footpath	Part-retrospective application for engineering works required to address erosion of the banks of the lake and removal of unsightly infrastructure in Gaywoods Fishery. The proposal seeks to utilise the deposited material in the corner of the site, to be redistributed around the lake's' perimeter. The application includes fishing bays and footpaths down to the banks of the lakes	Objection	See below
--------------	------------------------------------	---	-----------	-----------

The Parish Council objects to application 21/02669/FUL on the following material considerations:

1. Dacorum's Planning Enforcement Group and the Environment Agency have been involved with this site this year. As far as the Council is aware, their interest is continuing.
2. The application makes no reference to the in-filling of the lake at the north east corner as is apparent from Google Professional shots of the site. These have been made available to Planning Enforcement and the Environment Agency. These bear no relation to the shots from 2020 provided as part of the planning application which show no such in-filling.
3. The reference to 'engineering works required to address erosion of the banks of the lake' consequently appears redundant as material – presumably from off the site – has been deposited in the lake from the banks of the lake. This would suggest the heavy equipment on the site 24/7 and the in-filling has contributed to the erosion of the banks.
4. The reference to 'The proposal seeks to utilise the deposited material in the corner of the site, to be redistributed around the lake's' perimeter' consequently appears redundant as material – presumably from off the site as the application refers to using the additional material on the site – has been deposited in the lake.
5. The current application makes reference to planning approval given in 1977 which has no relevance to an application made nearly 50 years later, not least because the planning framework has changed significantly.
6. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF makes clear what very special circumstances there are when development of the Green Belt is permitted. This development does not meet any of these criteria. This is a Green Belt location as should be treated as such.
7. The application argues 'engineering operations' as an exemption, but addressing the erosion of lake banks in the way that has been adopted at this site does not fall within this definition.
8. Following flooding at Sunderlands Yard allotments, there is a suggestion that there is an 'overflow' from this site into the canal which may have contributed given the in-filling that has taken place.



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

21/02601/LBC	84 Waterside	Replacement front bedroom window, replacement ground floor window overlooking drive and replacement door	No objection	
21/02681/LDP	Kings Langley School Love Lane	Mobile floodlighting for tennis courts.	No objection	
21/02712/FUL	126 Hempstead Road	Construction of 26 no. 1 and 2 bedroom apartments with private amenity space	Objection	See below
21/02712/MFA	126 Hempstead Road	Construction of 26 no. 1 and 2 bedroom apartments with private amenity space	Objection	See below

The Parish Council objects to applications 21/02712/FUL and 21/02712/MFA as:

1. By reason of its bulk, the proposal would have a damaging visual impact on the openness of established, high value green belt preventing the coalescence of Hemel Hempstead and Kings Langley, over and above the embankment of the west coast mainline railway, and the scheme granted permission in April 2015.
2. By reason of its design, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character of the existing village and rural setting of the parish of Kings Langley, as there are no flats of this kind in the parish, there is no development as dense as this (130 dwellings per hectare) in the parish, and the examples cited in the design and access statement refer to Hemel Hempstead.
3. The proposal would have a harmful effect on the potential occupants, because, contrary to the claim made in the design and access statement, 16 of the 26 dwellings would not comply with modern floorspace requirements for dwellings - 50-55 square metres would not provide sufficient living space.
4. The proposal would not provide any amenity space whatsoever for potential occupants.
5. The proposal would not include any sustainability measures, because Network Rail has the right to object to and remove the line of trees along the rear of the site, and there do not appear to be any other measures detailed in the proposal.
6. The proposal is not located in a sustainable enough location, according to DBC's parking standards, to justify a reduction to only 1.00 parking spaces per dwelling.
7. Whilst affordable housing is important, these issues are so significant that they outweigh the proposal's affordable housing benefit.

21/02710/LBC	16 High Street Kings	Internal alterations to split No.18 and No.16 at first floor level	No objection	
21/02509/FUL	34 High Street	Construction of garden room/store	No objection	
21/02739/FHA	7 Beechfield	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension	No objection	
21/02753/FHA	132 Chipperfield Road	Ground and First Floor Rear Infill Extensions	No objection	
21/02657/FUL	Unit 1 Dronken House 43A High Street	Single storey small front extension to office barn and replacement roof.	No objection	



Edmund de Langley
&
Isabella de Castilla

KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

7. Planning Applications monthly update list.
 - 7.1 This report was noted.
8. Other Matters.
 - 8.1 None.
9. Any Other Business (not requiring formal decision).
 - 9.1 None.

Meeting Closed at 7:57pm