

**MINUTES OF PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 5 JANUARY 2015 IN THE ROBIN ROOM, THE CASTLE, HERTFORD AT 6.00PM**

PRESENT: Cllr N Wilson, in the Chair  
Councillors Mrs B Haddock, Dr L Radford, P Ruffles and R Willis

IN ATTENDANCE: Ms T Carpenter (Civic Administration Manager)  
8 Members of the public

**341. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

**342. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Ruffles	Declarable	3/14/2263/FP – 144 Mandeville Road	Cllr Ruffles is a former colleague of the neighbour
Cllr Ruffles	Declarable	3/14/2156/FP – 14 The Drive	The applicant is known to Cllr Ruffles
Cllr Wilson	Declarable	3/14/2240/FP – 111 Ware Road	Cllr Wilson advised neighbours of the process for voicing concerns on the application, but he stated that he had not viewed any of the plans prior to this meeting, or discussed the details with members of the public.

**343. THE MINUTES**

It was **RESOLVED** that:

The minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee Meetings held on 15 December 2014 were approved as a correct record of the proceedings, and the Chairman was authorised to sign the same.

**344. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES NOT DEALT WITH ELSEWHERE ON THE AGENDA – PAPER A**

Bollywoods – Concern was expressed that one of the boarded up windows did not seem secure. The Committee requested that Enforcement be contacted to ascertain when work would commence.

Flint Wall, Gwynns Walk – The Committee requested that information be ascertained as to who repaired the wall.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

The action sheet be noted.

**345. QUESTIONS AND/OR STATEMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Mr John Mitchell spoke on behalf of a number of neighbours of 111 Ware Road, regarding the proposed development at that site.

The concerns including the overbearing nature of the proposal at 20 feet tall and 63 feet long, inadequate parking for the proposed sewing studio, the design and appearance of the proposal which would be out of keeping with the Victorian and Edwardian buildings, overshadowing and overlooking concerns and loss of privacy along with the very real risk of creating a precedent for future two storey development in the area.

### 346. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered current planning applications, and commented as follows:

3/14/2156/FP/SD	14 The Drive	Single storey rear extension
No objection		

3/14/2182/FP/JS	22 Bengoe Street	Single storey rear extension
No objection		

3/14/2184/FP/MC	4 Lawrence Close	Single storey front extension
Objection: The proposal to build in front of the building line would lead to an undesirable precedent in this area.		

3/14/1789/FP/JS	52 Bullocks Lane	Demolition of existing chalet bungalow. Erection of 2 new houses with ancillary drives and paths
Objection: The proposal would represent an overdevelopment in the rural setting, would be out of keeping with the area and would crowd out existing structures. The current house is an individual Voysey's designed property, a 1920's structure, which is part of the Conservation Area and should not be demolished.		

3/14/2128/AD/MC	15-17 Maidenhead Street	Externally illuminated fascia sign and advertising hoardings
Objection: The design and colours of the fascia sign were considered totally out of keeping with the Conservation Area.		

3/14/2121/FP/JS	20A Parkhurst Road	Loft conversion with rear dormer
Objection: The dormer was considered overlarge and represented an over development for the size of the property.		

3/14/2213/FP/SD	122 The Avenue	Demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey side extension to create a self-contained annex facility with linkage to the main house and new garage at the side of the proposed extension
No objection		

3/14/2213/FP/MC	111 Ware Road	New double garage and workshop, home office/gym with studio above, to replace existing garages and cabin
Objection: The Committee raised a range of objections to the proposed structure, which was considered over large, an overdevelopment in a residential area, a dominant, non-conforming use which was alien to the neighbourhood grain, The proposal would clearly change the character of the neighbourhood and would have a detrimental impact in terms of over shadowing and loss of privacy on neighbouring properties, particularly to number 36 Tamworth Road and the stretch nearby. The access issues were also causing an unease to local residents, as well as the obtrusive		

nature of the materials, style and design of the structure. Concern was also raised that, if approved, the development could lead to a conversion to residential use at a later date, which was considered to be totally unacceptable. The Council has received a great deal of correspondence from the local community on this application and based on the information above, strongly objected to this application.

3/14/2259/FP/AH	The Warren St Marys Lane Hertingfordbury	Extensions/Alterations and new entrance gates
No objection.		

3/14/2263/FP/SD	144 Mandeville Road	Single storey rear and side extension
Objection: Whilst raising no objection to the rear extension, the Committee raised concerns regarding the proposed window in the side extension which would lead to overlooking of the neighbouring property. Furthermore, concern was raised as to building adjacent to the neighbouring building line which would impact on the neighbouring property.		

3/14/2248/FP/SD	82 Fore Street	Change of use from A1 (shops) to A1/A3 (shops/ restaurant and cafes).
Objection: The Committee considered there was an over proliferation of restaurants (A3) use in Hertford and objection to the loss of the A1 retail unit.		

3/14/2242/FP/AH	45 Railway Street	Change of use from hairdressers (class A1) to hairdressers/beauty salon (sui generis) (Retrospective).
No objection, although the Committee deplored the retrospective application.		

Councillors Ruffles and Wilson declared that any views expressed about applications were on the evidence before them so far, and at this meeting. They reserved the right to speak on additional evidence, which may be presented to them subsequently as District Councillors.

**347. DECISIONS RECEIVED FROM HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY AND EAST HERTS COUNCILS**

It was **RESOLVED** that:

The review of decision notices from East Herts Council be noted.

**348. CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**349. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA**

9 Fore Street – whilst key work to the damaged pargeting on the building had been carried out, it had been noticed that there was now a large damp patch appearing a few feet to the right of the previous work.

Meeting closed at 1920.