



The Radlett Centre  
1 Aldenham Avenue,  
Radlett.  
Herts WD7 8HL  
Tel: 01923 856433  
E-mail: [clerk@aldenham.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@aldenham.gov.uk)  
[www.aldenham.gov.uk](http://www.aldenham.gov.uk)

December 2020

Dear Mr Whear,

The APC planning committee thought it might be useful for you to have our feedback on planning applications in our Parish, which are considered in a meeting every two weeks. The committee appreciates that there is standard information to be provided for new planning applications, but hopes that some of our observations might assist the planning decision and consultation process.

### **1. Lack of basic information**

We have noticed that the quality of applications varies considerably and clearly larger applications need to provide more information and some will be better presented due to the quality of the professional team. However, some validated applications we are asked to comment on don't seem to provide even basic information, so it is difficult to identify, for example, whether the 45 degree or boundary distance requirements are breached. A recent example is 9 The Heath (app ref 20/1709/HSE) where no site plan was included. The lack of site plan meant that the breach of the 2m rule was not shown, a key consideration in this location particularly as there was a neighbour objection.

### **2. Difference in printed and online applications**

The application forms for making an application seem to vary between the printed version and the online planning portal version. The online version appears to require the applicant to make a more detailed analysis of their proposals in relation to neighbours, overlooking and impact under description of the development. If all application forms required the applicant to detail these issues, it would lead to more thought into development proposals and better quality applications.

### **3. Lack of construction management plan**

Concern has been raised that for many developments, there is either no or no adequate construction management plan provided in planning consents, or if there is one, there is little enforcement. In addition, little care or attention is given by contractors to the damage they cause to verges, footpaths and roadways. We appreciate that enforcement is time consuming, but would suggest that certainly for works involving substantial extensions or new builds, then some sort of financial security is taken and repaid when the works are completed and damage made good.

### **4. Street scene**

It would be useful if all applications needed to provide a street scene drawing as part of the application, where the building is being extended upwards or sideways (clearly not necessary for smaller additions such as porches or rear extensions). While this would be useful for consideration, it would also help focus applicants' minds on the impact of their proposals on the immediate environment.

### **5. Beyond economic repair**

Some applications use the argument that the existing dwelling is beyond economic repair. Clearly this is very relevant in Conservation Areas. However, whenever this is mentioned we have never seen supporting evidence and on some occasions these properties are being lived in. We struggle to understand how many of the properties we see can be described as beyond economic repair when most are 20th century buildings and perhaps just need a refurbishment. Some of the properties clearly afford an opportunity for increasing density with new buildings and helping satisfy housing need, but the committee believes there should be a requirement for applicants to show that a dwelling is beyond economic repair if they are going to use this argument as rationale for their proposals.

We hope these comments help. Of course, we appreciate that officers making their own enquiries may have information to which we are not party.

Thanks