

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 17th August 2020 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using <u>'Zoom' meeting website</u> -- meeting ID: 849 2943 1944.

Present: Cllrs M Cherry (Chairman), E Samuelson and A Rubinson.

Officer: P Paley (Planning Officer)

There was also one member of the public who joined the meeting during the discussion of the planning application number 20/1173/FUL.

# 249. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllrs J Lefton and S Khawaja.

# 250. Declarations of interest on any item on the Agenda.

- a) Disclosable pecuniary interests they or their spouse/partner have in any matter which is to be considered at this meeting.

  None.
- b) Members must also declare any other pecuniary or nonpecuniary interests they have in any matter to be considered at this meeting.

Cllr M Cherry declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application number 20/1111/HSE, 1 The Ridgeway, as the application site is opposite him.

# 251. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meetings held on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2020 and 3<sup>rd</sup> August

The minutes were confirmed and signed by Cllr M Cherry as a true record of those meetings.

# 252. To adjourn the meeting for members of the public to address the Committee (if any) in accordance with Standing Order 1 d.

At this point of the meeting, there were no members of the public.

# 253. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

The following applications were approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: -

20/0830/VOC 6 Loom Lane (APC - No objection with a condition)

20/0787/HSE 21 Homefield Rd (APC - No objection)

20/0934/HSE Staunton Cottage, The Avenue (APC - No objection)

20/0832/HSE 95 Newberries Ave (APC - No objection with comments)

20/0945/HSE 27 Radlett Park Rd (APC - No objection with a condition)

20/0663/HSE Spinneys, Loom Lane (APC - No objection)

20/0859/FUL Aldenham Golf and Country Club, Church Lane, Aldenham

(APC - No objection with a condition)

The following applications have gone to appeal: -



20/0149/HSE 8 Park Rd (APC - No objection with a condition) 20/0429/HSE 28 The Crosspath (APC - Objected)

The following application has been withdrawn: - 20/0840/FUL 31 Beech Ave (APC – Objected)

# 254. Date of next meeting

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday 7th September 2020

# 255. Planning Applications

THEIR DEIT	g no further	Dusiness t	ne meet	ing closed	at 3.43pm.	
Chairman			Da	ate		

# Planning applications discussed at meeting on 17th August 2020

# 20/1107/VOC 126A Watling St

**Proposal:** - Application for variation of a Condition 2 (Plans) to increase the height of rear gable and Condition 3 (Materials) to allow for changes to external materials and landscaping following grant of planning permission 17/1067/FUL and 18/0725/FUL.

This application had been declared invalid so was not discussed.

# 20/1112/HSE 20 Hilfield Road

**Proposal:** - Alterations to existing dwelling including modification to roof structure with insertion of roof lights to the side elevation, removal of chimney and enlargement of side dormer. Front infill porch extension with new flat roof, render to all elevations and alterations to fenestration (Amended description only).

No comment.

## 20/1111/HSE 1 The Ridgeway

**Proposal: -** Construction of single storey rear extension to incorporate an indoor pool, new patio area and alterations to fenestration.

#### Object: -

The proposed extension will result in a significant breach of the 45-degree angle rule, (Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, section 1. B and c.). Whilst the principle of development at the property is reasonable, the siting of the extension so close to the boundary and the breach of the 45-degree angle is not acceptable.

### 20/1024/HSE 16 Radlett Park Road

**Proposal:** - Retrospective application for an outbuilding to the front garden



Members noted that the outbuilding, is in breach of policy in terms of location as it is positioned forward of the building line. Members suggested that, if the Local Planning Authority is minded to grant consent, it should include a condition to ensure that the building is screened, on the street side, with appropriate vegetation.

# 20/1137/HSE 6 Scrubbitts Park Road

**Proposal: -** Two storey side, single storey rear, repositioning of front door with new front porch and changes to fenestration

Object: -

The proposal would breach the 2 metre (to the boundary rule) at first floor level (Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, section 4. j, k and l.) which would result in an over dominant structure in the street scene.

# 20/1113/HSE 54 Gills Hill Lane

**Proposal: -** Erection of new enclosed porch and stairs to front elevation **No objection.** 

# 20/1173/FUL 10 Aldenham Ave

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing house, garage, and associated outbuildings, and construction of  $3 \times 4$  new detached dwellings ( $1 \times 3$ -bed,  $2 \times 4$ -bed) with associated parking and landscaping.

Members had no objections, in principle, to the development of the site. Members believe that a development of two houses rather than three would be preferable in a similar design to that proposed. Also, members would rather see the retention of the existing trees and would favour a green boundary treatment over the wrought iron fencing that has been proposed.

Members would also question whether there is sufficient parking allowed for each house as there is little on street parking in the vicinity.

Finally, Members would like confirmation that the development proposed is acceptable on highway grounds bearing in mind that this site is on a dangerous corner of a busy road.

# 20/1190/HSE 20 Bridgefoot Cottages, Radlett Road, Colney Street, St. Albans

**Proposal: -** Two storey side extension and re-roofing of single storey front and rear extension

No objection.

# 20/1212/HSE 7 Folly Close

**Proposal: -** Single storey rear extension



Members had no objections to the application subject to compliance with the 45-degree angle rule (Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, section 1. b, and c.)

# 20/0920/HSE 5 Holbrook Gardens, Aldenham

**Proposal: -** Single storey rear extension

Members agreed that the comments made previously still apply now. Object: -

- a) Proposal would breach the 45-degree angle rule. This would not accord with the guidelines set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, section 1, 'Single storey rear extensions and conservatories' b and c: -
- 'b. Rear extensions should be set comfortably within the line drawn at 45 degrees from the nearest edge of the neighbouring front or rear facing windows.'
- 'c. Where extensions either breach this 45-degree line or extend more than 3.35 metres beyond the original rear building line, the Council is likely to refuse the application.'
- b) The proposed extension would be built right on the boundary and would be higher than the boundary fence. This would have a negative impact on the amenity of the neighbours affecting their light. This would not comply with policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Plan, for the following reason: 'Development which complies with the policies in this Plan will be permitted provided it:
- (iii) results in a high quality design.

In order to achieve a high quality design, a development must:

(ii) have limited impact on the amenity of occupiers of the site, its neighbours, and its surroundings in terms of outlook, privacy, light, nuisance and pollution.'

Members question whether future development rights were removed when the properties were originally built.

## 20/1197/HSE 89 Newberries Ave

**Proposal:** - Part single/part two storey front and rear extensions, and first floor side extension.

Object: -

Members do not support this application as the proposal would result in a significant breach of the 2 metres (to the boundary) rule at first floor level (Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, section 4. j, k and I.) and that applies to both sides of the building. This in turn leads to a breach of the policy on crown roofs ((Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, section 3. J.) and does not comply with policy SADM 30 in terms of excessive mass and bulk.



If officers are minded to approve this application, members would request that permitted development rights be withdrawn.