



Edmund de Langley  
&  
Isabella de Castilla

# KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

## PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

**MINUTES of the Meeting held “virtually” at 7:45pm on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021.**

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

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

1. Apologies for Absence.

1.1 Cllr McLean.

2. Declarations of Interest.

2.1 Cllr Johnson declared a Personal Interest in planning application 21/02796/FHA (1 The Orchard) as he knows the joint owners of the company applying.

3. Public Participation / Question Time.

3.1 None.

4. Consideration of Planning Applications.

4.1 Current applications.

Reference	Address	Details of Application	Submission	Reason (if any)
21/02775/FHA	41 Rockliffe Avenue	Single storey fill in extension to the front / side 2.4m x3.5m.	No objection	
21/02796/FHA	1 The Orchard	Removal of garage, reduction in ground level to create a level garden (maximum reduction 1400mm), creation of split level in approved rear extension.	Objection	The Council objects to this application as it contains no provision for car parking.
21/02712/MFA (amended)	126 Hempstead Road	Construction of 26 no. 1 and 2 bedroom apartments with private amenity space	Objection	See below

The council maintains its objection to planning application 21/02712/MFA (126 Hempstead Road) for the following reasons:

1.
  - (a) The agent avoids the fact that the new proposal would be twenty times the size of the proposal previously permitted. The footprint would be increased from very approximately 60 square metres to 1,200 square metres, so the new proposal would be a significantly larger building.
  - (b) The railway embankment is only two storeys high, so the much wider third storey would stand out in the landscape and the Gade valley significantly more than the one already permitted.



Edmund de Langley  
&  
Isabella de Castilla

# KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

## PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

- (c) One needs to compare or weigh the various planning issues overall, and it is not correct that affordable housing takes precedence over specifically the impact on the openness of the Green Belt, because otherwise there wouldn't be any control over Green Belt development at all.
- 2.
- (a) Contrary to the claim made by the agent, the site is not in a transitional area at the edge of the boundary, because, as the agent admits in his very next sentence, the examples cited in Hemel Hempstead are 300m away. The proposal is located in the rural area surrounding Kings Langley, which defines the village and parish character, as well as preventing coalescence.
- (b) The agent's comment that this site is located 1.5km from the village centre weakens the argument for development, as development, especially those of higher density, should be permitted closer to settlement centres, rather than in more remote locations.
3. The council remains concerned that 16 of the 26 proposed dwellings would not have sufficient living space, as the number of storeys in the guidelines relates to the flat, not the whole building.
4. The winter gardens proposed do not qualify as amenity space, and even if they did, 5 metres squared per property would be woefully insufficient, even for small dwellings.
5. It remains the case that the applicant is not offering any environmentally sustainability measures through the planning process. As already explained, Network Rail has the right to remove and would remove the only measures included in the application, viz the trees along the rear of the site.
6. The provision of Affordable Housing is only one of the factors involved in determining planning applications. As said already, it does not take precedence over any one of the other issues, and in our view, there are many significant problems with this proposal, which outweigh the provision of Affordable Housing.

21/02856/LBC	3-4 Una Way, High Street	Two storey side extension and associated landscaping works (amended plans).	Objection	The Council objects to this application as it feels that the extension is still out of keeping with an historical building.
21/02933/FHA	10 Beechfield	Part single, part two storey rear extension, single storey side extension and front porch alterations.	No objection	

### 5. Other Matters.

#### 5.1 Dacorum Borough Council.

##### 5.1.1 Drop-in session with the Planning Department (see enclosed).

This item was included for information and participation if Members wished to attend.

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

- 6.1 Cllr Anderson reported that he would be attending the Planning Inspectorate appeal into the proposed Motorway Service Area at Junction 16/17 of the M25 on 17<sup>th</sup> August. He had registered to speak, if only to rebut any suggestions that Junction 20 would be a better site.

Meeting Closed at 8:01pm.