



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 21st September 2020 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using ['Zoom' meeting website](#) -- meeting ID: 889 9301 4332

Present: Cllrs M Cherry (Chairman), E Samuelson, J Lefton, A Rubinson and G Taylor (co-opted member)

Officer: P Paley (Planning Officer)

There was also one member of the public.

265. Apologies for absence

An apology was received from Cllr S Khawaja.

266. 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 non-pecuniary interests they have in any matter to be considered at this meeting.

Mr G Taylor (co-opted member) declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application number 20/1375/HSE, 121 Newberries Avenue, as it is his neighbour's house.

267. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meetings held on 7th September 2020

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

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

Cllr M Cherry suspended standing orders and invited the member of the public to speak.

The member of the public spoke regarding planning application number 20/1344/HSE, 20 Homefield Road.

The member of the public was thanked and standing orders were resumed.

269. To discuss the following: -



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

The government consultation on the planning white paper, [Planning for the future](#).

The Committee discussed the above Consultation document and gave the following answers to the questions posed: -

Q1: What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

Answer to Q1: Slow, inconsistent, arbitrary.

Q2: Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area?

Answer to Q2: Yes

Q2(a). If no, why not?

Answer to Q2 (a): N/a

Q3: Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future?

[Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / Other – please specify]

Answer to Q3: Other – all of the above.

Q4: What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area?

[Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street/ Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]

Answer to Q4: More or better local infrastructure. Protection of green spaces. The design of new homes and places.

Q5: Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals?

Answer to Q5: Yes

Q6: Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?

Answer to Q6: Yes with the exception of para. 2.15.

Q7(a): Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of "sustainable development", which would include consideration of environmental impact?

Answer to Q7(a): No



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Q7(b): How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

Answer to Q7(b): The formal Duty to Co-operate should remain.

Q8(a): Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?

Answer to Q8(a): Not sure.

Q8(b): Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?

Answer to Q8(b): Not sure. If you increase the supply in wealthy areas, you will not necessarily improve affordability. The developer will control supply to maximise value and profitability.

Q9(a): Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent?

Answer to Q9(a): No.

Q9(b): Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas?

Answer to Q9(b): No. It may lead to repeated poor design and development.

Q9(c): Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?

Answer to Q9(c): Not sure.

Q10: Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?

Answer to Q10: Yes.

Q11: Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans?

Answer to Q11: Yes

Q12: Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?

Answer to Q12: Yes but with the possibility to extend if there are extenuating circumstances.

Q13(a): Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?

Answer to Q13(a): Yes



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Q13(b): How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

Answer to Q13(b): Anything which makes the planning process more accessible should be incorporated. Accessibility needs to be improved.

Q14: Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?

Answer to Q14: Yes. Members agreed that there should be a stronger emphasis but we are not sure how you would do it as it is led by market forces.

Q15: What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area?

[Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/or poorly-designed / There hasn't been any / Other – please specify]

Answer to Q15: Other. Some good, some bad. Often the infrastructure is not in place before development is started.

Q16: Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area?

[Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify]

Answer to Q16: More green and open spaces

Q17: Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?

Answer to Q17: Yes.

Q18: Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making?

Answer to Q18: Yes, but this should be backed up by a design panel.

Q19: Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?

Answer to Q19: Yes.

Q20: Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty?

Answer to Q20: Yes.

Q21: When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?

[More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops and/or employment space / Green space / Don't know / Other – please specify]



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Answer to Q21: More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools health provision)

Q22(a): Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?

Answer to Q22(a): No, but the Community Infrastructure Levy needs updating.

Q22(b): Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally?

[Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / Locally]

Answer to Q22(b): Locally

Q22(c): Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities?

[Same amount overall / More value / Less value / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Answer to Q22(c): Yes. Same amount overall.

Q22(d): Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?

Answer to Q22(d): Yes. Only to support infrastructure.

Q23: Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights?

Answer to Q23: Yes.

Q24(a): Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present?

Answer to Q24(a): Yes.

Q24(b): Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities?

Answer to 24(b): Yes.

Q24(c): If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk?

Answer to 24(c): Yes.

Q24(d): If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality?

Answer to Q24(d): Yes.



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Q25: Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?

Answer to Q25: Yes.

Q25(a): If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed?

Answer to Q25(a): Yes.

Q26: Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

Answer to Q26: No.

270. For information: Planning Applications of the following type: - Certificate of Lawful Development (Existing) CLE, Certificate of Lawful Development (Proposed) CLP and Listed Building Consent LBC.

20/1343/CLP 16 Aldenham Avenue

Proposal: Single storey rear timber orangery. Certificate of lawfulness (proposed)

20/1320/LBC War Memorial, Watling Street

Proposal: Cleaning of War Memorial surfaces. (Application for Listed Building Consent).

20/1365/CLP 31 New Road

Proposal: Conversion of loft to habitable room with rear dormer. Certificate of Lawful Development (Proposed).

20/1394/LBC Glebe House Church Lane Aldenham

Proposal: Replacement of metal rooflight window to internal roof valley gutter (Application for Listed Building Consent).

These were noted.

271. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

The following applications were approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: -
20/1075/HSE Phillimore House, Watling Street, Elstree (APC - No objection with conditions)

20/1071/HSE 32 Links Drive (APC – No objection)

20/1087/HSE 43 Newlands Avenue (APC – No objection with comments)

20/1074/HSE 39 Watford Road (APC – No objection)



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

20/1112/HSE 20 Hilfield Lane, Aldenham (APC – No comment)
20/1111/HSE 1 The Ridgeway (APC – Objected)

The following applications were refused by Hertsmere Borough Council: -
20/0906/FUL Slades Farm, Butterfly Lane, Elstree (APC – Objected)
20/1093/HSE Primrose Cottage, Common Lane, Letchmore Heath (APC – No objection)
20/1059/FUL Delrow Edge, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham (APC – No objection)

The following application has gone to appeal: -
20/0294/FUL High Cross Garage, High Cross, Aldenham (APC - No comments, meeting inquorate)

272. Date of next meeting

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday 5th October 2020

273. Planning Applications

There being no further business the meeting closed at 5.00pm.

Chairman..... Date.....

Planning applications discussed at meeting on 21st September 2020

20/1344/HSE 20 Homefield Road

Proposal: - Installation of an electronic entrance gate at front boundary.

Object: -

- a) The proposed entrance gate is not typical of this street which has open or green frontages. A similar application was refused and dismissed at appeal at 16 Williams Way in Radlett (application number 16/1485/HSE). Like Williams Way, Homefield Road is also a road characterized by open driveways. In his reasons given to dismiss that appeal, the Inspector had agreed that the application would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 7, k: -**
'At 7.k the Council's Planning and Design Guide SPD 2006 (Part E) sets out that where gates are exceptionally granted due to the particular circumstances of an individual property they should,



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

amongst other matters, be well-screened and not dominate the streetscene.'

Furthermore, the Inspector gave considerable weight to policy SADM 30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Plan in his reasons to dismiss the appeal: -

'Amongst other things policy SADM30 states that development will be permitted provided it recognises and complements the particular local character of the area. That is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements at section 7 to reinforce local distinctiveness and respond to local character,'

The Inspector had stated that the scheme, which had been proposed at 16 Williams Way, would conflict with the guidance given above.

Lastly, his conclusion was: -

'Given the significant harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.'

Just like the proposal at 16 Williams Way, the gated style of frontage, proposed in this application at 20 Homefield Road, would not fit in with the street scene and would harm the character of the area.

This proposal does not respond positively to local townscape and landscape character. It would not therefore accord with policy HD3 of the emerging Radlett Neighbourhood Plan and should not be supported.

- b) Also, the location of the proposed gate is right on the boundary which does not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 7, k which states that gates: -
'should be set back from the street'

20/1295/FUL 14 Links Drive

Proposal: - Demolition of existing detached bungalow, construction of replacement detached 2 storey, 5 bed dwelling to include lower ground level and accommodation in the roof space and construction of a garden room to rear of property with associated parking and landscaping.

Object: -

- a) This proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site. It fails to acknowledge the two metre (to the boundary rule) on both sides. This would not comply with policy HD5, para e, of the Radlett Design Code from the emerging Radlett Neighbourhood Plan: -



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

'Spacing between the building and boundary shall be no less than 1m at ground floor level and a minimum of 2m for extensions which are 2 or more storeys'.

Likewise, the boundary spacing would not accord with the guidelines set out in section 4j and k of the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E: -

'Proposals in these areas should ensure that two storey side extensions should be located a minimum of 2 metres away from the side boundary – regardless of the position of any existing ground floor extension or garage to be replaced.'

- b) The overdevelopment of the site is further exaggerated by the fact that the proposal includes a crown roof. This would not comply with Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 3, j: -
'Crown or mansard roofs on large extensions will be rejected by the council as they often detract from the design and character of the existing house.'
- c) The proposal is to demolish a small dwelling and build a 5 bedroomed house with accommodation in the roof space and lower ground level. This would not comply with the section on 'Radlett Bungalows' in policy HD8 of the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan. The aim of objective 3 of policy HD8 of the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan is: -
'To support the development and/or retention of smaller homes available to younger people and older downsizers;'
In the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan, HD8.1, bungalows have been identified (individually and as a group) as making a positive contribution to local townscape character and this contribution should be protected or enhanced.

Members noted that no landscape plan and no parking plan have been submitted with the application. Members would question whether the scheme complies with parking standards.

20/1357/HSE 8 Park Road

Proposal: - Retention of outbuilding to rear of property.

Object: -

- a) This is a further extension of an already overly large out building and there is no justification for having a building of this size in this garden.
- b) The building is in breach of the one metre (to the boundary) rule: -
- policy HD5, para e, of the Radlett Design Code from the emerging Radlett Neighbourhood Plan states: -



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

'Spacing between the building and boundary shall be no less than 1m at ground floor level and a minimum of 2m for extensions which are 2 or more storeys'.

- c) The site is in a Conservation Area and also next to a historic site known as Malt Lane. As there is no screening the building may be visible from Malt Lane. This would not comply with policy SADM29 of the Hertsmere Borough Council, Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan: -
***'In Conservation Areas the Council will seek to:
(ii) retain important open spaces and views;'***

20/1360/HSE 21 Letchmore Road

Proposal: - Single storey front and rear extension

Members had no objection to the proposals but would question whether the 45-degree angle rule has been breached.

20/1375/HSE 121 Newberries Avenue

Proposal: - Part single, part two storey rear extension and new front porch. Conversion of garage to habitable room. Conversion of loft to habitable room with rear dormer and three front rooflights. Application of render to all elevations and changes to hard landscaping at front boundary.

Object: -

- d) **The proposed increase in the ridge height will result in an overbearing property in the street scene.**
- e) **The proposal includes a crown roof which does not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 3,j: -
'Crown or mansard roofs on large extensions will be rejected by the council as they often detract from the design and character of the existing house.'**
- f) **The extended property would breach the two metre (to the boundary) rule on one side. This would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. Section 4, j and k: -
'Proposals in these areas should ensure that two storey side extensions should be located a minimum of 2 metres away from the side boundary'**
- g) **The application includes 3 roof lights in the front roof face. This would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 6,s: -
'The number of roof lights should be kept to a minimum and limited to rear elevations.'**
- h) **Members would question whether there would be adequate parking spaces for a five bedroomed property.**



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

i) The dormer window in the rear roof face may give rise to overlooking.

20/1393/FUL 84 Watling Street

Proposal: - Erection of a rear 2-storey attached dwelling, first floor rear extension to existing building with change of use of ground floor from E to C3 to create 2 x 2-bed and 1 x 1-bed flats. Revised application.

In principle members agreed that the proposal to make the building all residential was acceptable but would defer to the Heritage Officer in respect of the look of the rear extension of the property.

Also, the building would be very limited on amenity space.

Members would also question the design of the one bed roomed ground floor flat and the living standards it could provide.

Members added that they would like to see the building restored with matching materials where appropriate.

20/1406/FUL 12 Newlands Avenue

Proposal: - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a 5-bed detached dwelling to include new wrought iron gates, railings and brick piers, the formation of new access, and associated ancillary works.

Members had no objections, in principle, to the application but the three dormers at the front do not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 6, g: -

'The Council will resist dormers within the front roof face unless they are a dominant or original feature of the street scene.'

Also, the proposed railings do not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 7, n: -

'In areas dominated by green front and side boundary treatments, changes to front and side boundaries should reflect this in their designs, and should not use hard features such as railings, walls and fences to define boundaries'

Members would rather see green frontages with railings behind.

20/1380/HSE 26 Oakridge Avenue

Proposal: - Part single/part two storey front extension with alterations to porch, and first floor side and rear extensions.

Members had no objections, in principle to this application subject to there being no breach of the 45-degree angle rule with number 24 Oakridge Ave.



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

The proposal would breach the two metre (from the boundary) rule but the effect of this would be minimal as the level of the land is lower than the neighbour.