



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 7th September 2020 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using ['Zoom' meeting website](#) -- meeting ID: 892 1863 1149.

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

Officer: P Paley (Planning Officer)

There were also five member of the public

256. Apologies for absence

An apology was received from Cllr S Khawaja.

257. 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.

Cllr E Samuelson declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application number 20/1265/FUL, Spylaw House Newlands Avenue, as the neighbour is known to her.

Cllr M Cherry declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application number 20/1265/FUL, Spylaw House Newlands Avenue, as his opposite neighbour is the owner of the site.

All members declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application numbers 20/1280/HSE 1 Gills Hill and 20/1260/HSE 475 Watling St as both properties back onto Aldenham Parish Council land.

258. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meetings held on 17th August

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

259. 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 members of the public to speak.

One member of the public spoke regarding planning application number 20/1281/FUL 31 Beech Avenue.

One member of the public spoke regarding planning application number 20/1265/FUL Spylaw House Newlands Avenue.



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

One member of the public spoke regarding planning application number 20/1266/HSE 54 Williams Way.

Two members of the public chose to observe.

The members of the public were thanked and standing orders were resumed.

260. To discuss the following: -

The government consultation on 'Changes to the current Planning System'. Please click on the following link: -

[Changes to the current planning system](#)

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

: -

Q1: Do you agree that planning practice guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is whichever is the higher of the level of 0.5% of housing stock in each local authority area OR the latest household projections averaged over a 10-year period?

Q2: In the stock element of the baseline, do you agree that 0.5% of existing stock for the standard method is appropriate? If not, please explain why.

Answers to Q1 and Q2 Not qualified to comment.

Q3: Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio from the most recent year for which data is available to adjust the standard method's baseline is appropriate? If not, please explain why.

Q4: Do you agree that incorporating an adjustment for the change of affordability over 10 years is a positive way to look at whether affordability has improved? If not, please explain why.

Q5: Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the standard method? If not, please explain why.

Answers to Q3, 4 and 5 Not qualified to comment

Q6: Authorities which are already at the second stage of the strategic plan consultation process (Regulation 19), which should be given 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate for examination?

Q7: Authorities close to publishing their second stage consultation (Regulation 19), which should be given 3 months from the publication date of the revised guidance to publish their Regulation 19 plan, and a further 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate?

Answers to Q6 and Q7 These questions make no sense. They are very poor English.

Q8: The Government is proposing policy compliant planning applications will deliver a minimum of 25% of onsite affordable housing as First Homes, and a minimum of 25% of offsite contributions towards First Homes where appropriate.



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Which do you think is the most appropriate option for the remaining 75% of affordable housing secured through developer contributions? Please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):

- i) Prioritising the replacement of affordable home ownership tenures, and delivering rental tenures in the ratio set out in the local plan policy.
- ii) Negotiation between a local authority and developer.
- iii) Other (please specify)

Answer to Q8. Members chose Option I as this will provide more certainty of delivery.

Q9: Should the existing exemptions from the requirement for affordable home ownership products (e.g. for build to rent) also apply to this First Homes requirement?

Answer to Q9: No, unless it makes First Homes cheaper.

Q10: Are any existing exemptions not required? If not, please set out which exemptions and why.

Q11: Are any other exemptions needed? If so, please provide reasons and /or evidence for your views.

Answers to Q10 and Q11 Members cannot comment on these questions.

Q12: Do you agree with the proposed approach to transitional arrangements set out above?

Answer to Q12: Members agree with this approach.

Q13: Do you agree with the proposed approach to different levels of discount?

Answer to Q13: Not qualified to comment

Q14: Do you agree with the approach of allowing a small proportion of market housing on First Homes exception sites, in order to ensure site viability?

Answer to Q14: Yes.

Q15: Do you agree with the removal of the site size threshold set out in the National Planning Policy Framework?

Answer to Q15: Members were unable to comment as there is insufficient information.

Q16: Do you agree that the First Homes exception sites policy should not apply in designated rural areas?

Answer to Q16: This should be a local decision.

Q17: Do you agree with the proposed approach to raise the small sites threshold for a time-limited period?

Answer to Q17: No, Members did not agree with this approach.

Q18: What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold?

- i) Up to 40 homes
- ii) Up to 50 homes
- iii) Other (please specify)

Answer to Q18: Members chose option iii) 'other' as they believe it should be kept at the existing level.

Q19: Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold?



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Answer to Q19: No.

Q20: Do you agree with linking the time-limited period to economic recovery and raising the threshold for an initial period of 18 months?

Answer to Q20: No.

Q21: Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects?

Answer to Q21: Yes (para81) Members agreed that measures/guidance need to be in place to prevent developers avoiding paying contributions by doing phased developments.

Q22: Do you agree with the Government's proposed approach to setting thresholds in rural areas?

Answer to Q22: Yes.

Q23: Are there any other ways in which the Government can support SME builders to deliver new homes during the economic recovery period?

Answer to Q23: Members suggested that the Apprenticeship Scheme could be further incentivised.

Q24: Do you agree that the new Permission in Principle should remove the restriction on major development?

Answer to Q24: Absolutely not.

Q25: Should the new Permission in Principle for major development set any limit on the amount of commercial development (providing housing still occupies the majority of the floorspace of the overall scheme)? Please provide any comments in support of your views.

Answer to Q25: Yes of course it should. Members felt that the limit for commercial development should be low – less than 10%.

Q26: Do you agree with our proposal that information requirements for Permission in Principle by application for major development should broadly remain unchanged? If you disagree, what changes would you suggest and why?

Answer to Q26: Members disagreed with this proposal. All major developments cannot be given any form of consent without understanding the transport and infrastructure proposed for the developments.

Q27: Should there be an additional height parameter for Permission in Principle? Please provide comments in support of your views.

Answer to Q27: No. Members agreed that it should be site specific and decided on a site by site basis. The proposed height of development must be stipulated and then determined by the local authority.

Q28: Do you agree that publicity arrangements for Permission in Principle by application should be extended for large developments? If so, should local planning authorities be:

- i) required to publish a notice in a local newspaper?
- ii) subject to a general requirement to publicise the application or
- iii) both?
- iv) disagree

If you disagree, please state your reasons.



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Answer to Q28: Yes, and members chose option iii) 'both'. Proposals for major development should be publicised.

Q29: Do you agree with our proposal for a banded fee structure based on a flat fee per hectare, with a maximum fee cap?

Answer to Q29: All fees should reasonably compensate the costs incurred by the deciding authority.

Q30: What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why?

Answer to Q30: Please see answer to Q29. All fees should reasonably compensate the costs incurred by the deciding authority.

Q31: Do you agree that any brownfield site that is granted Permission in Principle through the application process should be included in Part 2 of the Brownfield Land Register? If you disagree, please state why.

Answer to Q31: Yes.

Q32: What guidance would help support applicants and local planning authorities to make decisions about Permission in Principle? Where possible, please set out any areas of guidance you consider are currently lacking and would assist stakeholders.

Answer to Q32: Firstly, members agreed that guidance should be written in plain English and with less jargon.

Secondly, transport access and infrastructure is key in deciding development. Permission in principle should include appropriate caveats when a decision is made about granting permission in principle.

Q33: What costs and benefits do you envisage the proposed scheme would cause? Where you have identified drawbacks, how might these be overcome?

Answer to Q33: Not sufficiently qualified to answer. Members agreed that the answers to this question would be very complex and not straightforward.

Q34: To what extent do you consider landowners and developers are likely to use the proposed measure? Please provide evidence where possible.

Answer to Q34: Not sufficiently qualified to answer. Members agreed that the answers to this question would be very complex and not straightforward.

Q35: In light of the proposals set out in this consultation, are there any direct or indirect impacts in terms of eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations on people who share characteristics protected under the Public Sector Equality Duty?

Answer to Q35: Members were not aware of any impacts as detailed in the question.

Members wished to point out that this consultation is poorly written.

**261. 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.**

20/1269/PD560 Battlers Green Farm Common Lane



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Proposal: - Change of use from agricultural storage to flexible commercial use.

20/1284/LBC Haberdashers Askes Boys School Butterfly Lane Elstree

Proposal: - Alterations to specific sections of a listed terracotta wall to include associated connected paths and terrace steps within the grounds of The Haberdashers Askes School (Application for Listed Building Consent).

20/1200/LBC Haberdashers Askes Boys School Butterfly Lane Elstree

Proposal: - Erection of a Pre-Preparatory School building and re-purposing of the Round

House lodge building with associated external play areas, landscaping and reconfiguration and extension of the Butterfly Lane car parking area (Application for Listed Building Consent).

These were noted.

262. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

The following applications were approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: -

20/0980/FUL 24 Newlands Ave (APC - No objection with comment)

20/0842/FUL Bhaktivedanta Manor, Dharam Marg, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham (APC - No objection)

20/0985/HSE 38 Craigweil Ave (APC - No objection with a condition)

20/0304/FUL Aldenham Golf And Country Club, Church Lane, Aldenham (APC - No comments made meeting inquorate)

20/0921/VOC The White House, Waterside (APC - No objection with comment)

20/0920/HSE 5 Holbrook Gardens, Aldenham (APC - Objected)

20/1022/HSE 17 Folly Close (APC - No objection)

20/1005/HSE Linden House, 58 Newberries Avenue (APC - Comments made with a condition)

Appeals have been made by A F Pinkerton and Partners in respect of Blackbirds Farm, Blackbirds Lane, Aldenham. These appeals relate to conditions which are attached to planning permissions for changes and additional development relating to the composting operation at Blackbirds Farm, granted by the County Council in May 2019.

The following applications have been withdrawn: -

20/0991/VOC 126A Watling St (APC - Comments made)

20/0541/FUL Land At Ham Farm Stables, Hogg Lane, Elstree (APC - No objection but with concerns)



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

263. Date of next meeting

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday 21st September 2020

264. Planning Applications

There being no further business the meeting closed at 4.45pm.

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

Planning applications discussed at meeting on 7th September 2020

20/1237/VOC 4 Hilfield Lane, Aldenham

Proposal: - Application for variation of Condition 2 (Plans) to allow for retention of a single storey outbuilding behind plot 2 following grant of planning permission 19/1994/FUL.

No comment.

20/1228/HSE 16 Shenley Hill

Proposal: - Conversion of garage to habitable room, part single, part two storey side extension and first floor side and rear extensions with conversion of loft to habitable room with 2 roof lights to side (Amended description only)

Object: -

- a) **The depth of the proposed extensions would be excessive on this plot as it is very narrow in width. Adjacent plots are much wider than this one.**
- b) **The proposal includes a large crown roof. This does not accord with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, EKP-5: - 'The Council will normally resist extensions which result in crown roofs, as they tend to add considerable bulk.'**
- c) **Four parking spaces would be needed for the increased size of the house but cars would have to reverse out from the driveway onto a busy road to let other cars out as the space is minimal.**

20/1260/HSE 475 Watling St

Proposal: - Two storey and first floor side extensions. First floor and single storey rear extensions. Replacement of rear window at 2nd floor level to patio doors with balcony (Amended description only).

Object: -

The proposals are not policy compliant for the following reasons: -

- a) **The proposed rear extensions are a poor design and will result in an unattractive addition to the house. This does not comply with Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan: -**



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

'Development which complies with the policies in this Plan will be permitted provided it:

(iii) results in a high quality design.'

- b) The proposed extension at ground floor level will breach the 45-degree angle rule. This does not comply with Section 1, b of the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E.**

'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) The proposed Juliet balcony will result in overlooking the neighbours gardens. This does not comply with Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan: -**

'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.'

- d) The proposed first floor extensions will breach the two metre (to the boundary) rule which applies to areas like Radlett. Section 4, k of the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E states that: -**

'Proposals in these areas should ensure that two storey side extensions should be located a minimum of 2 metres away from the side boundary'

20/1265/FUL Spylaw House Newlands Avenue

Proposal: - Demolition of existing 2 storey dwelling and erection of replacement detached 7 bed house to include lower ground floor level with pool and accommodation in the roof space (revised application from 17/1896/FUL).

Object: -

- a) The site is in the Conservation area next to a heritage asset known as Malt Lane. This proposal would not comply with Policy SADM29 of the Hertsmere Borough Council - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan as it would have a negative effect on this historic asset: -**

'In Conservation Areas the Council will seek to:

(iv) obtain improvements which enhance the area.

In particular, proposals resulting in the loss of buildings and structures in Conservation Areas will not be permitted unless:

***(i) the building or structure is beyond economic repair; or
(ii) its removal and replacement would be beneficial to the character or appearance of the area.'***

- b) The proposal would not comply with Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Borough Council - Site Allocations and Development**



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Management Policies Plan as the scale of the new house would have a negative effect on the neighbours: -

'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.'

- c) The proposal does not comply with the policies set out in the Radlett Neighbourhood Development Plan namely HD5 'Radlett Design Principles' and HD6 'Healthy High Quality Trees and Hedges' – healthy trees have already been removed from the site. The Radlett Neighbourhood Development Plan is now at the stage where it is a material consideration in determining planning applications.**

Members wished to point out that several of the reports submitted with this application are now out of date. The tree report is dated 2016 and the Design and Access statement is dated 2017.

Members would like to request that a Borough Councillor call this application in to Committee.

20/1266/HSE 54 Williams Way

Proposal: - Demolition of existing front porch, removal of first floor pitch roof and dormer windows. New first floor accommodation with new flat roof, rendering all elevations with part timber cladding and alterations of windows to front and rear elevations.

Object: -

- a) The proposed changes and alterations to this house are poorly designed and would not therefore comply with SADM 30 of the Hertsmere Borough Council - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan: -**

'Development which complies with the policies in this Plan will be permitted provided it:

(i) makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment;

(ii) recognises and complements the particular local character of the area in which it is located, and

(ii) results in a high quality design.'

- b) The changes to the chalet bungalow would not comply with HD8.1 of the Radlett Design Principles set out in the Radlett Neighbourhood Development Plan: -**

'Development proposals which impact on any of the Radlett Bungalows identified for their individual and/or group value in contributing positively to local townscape character should protect or enhance this contribution.'



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

20/1280/HSE 1 Gills Hill

Proposal: - Demolition of existing garage and side extension and construction of two storey side extensions to both sides, 2 storey rear extension, basement garage and alterations to fenestration. Roof alterations to include 2 rear dormer windows with Juliet balconies to create additional accommodation in the roof space, removal of chimney stacks and insertion of roof lights to side and rear elevations.

Members had no objections to the proposals but would prefer if the side windows were made of obscure glass.

Also, members believe that the appearance of the house would be improved if the extension was subservient to the main building.

20/1289/HSE Tree Tops 5 The Warren

Proposal: - Alterations to elevations and part single storey rear extension
No objection.

20/1281/FUL 31 Beech Avenue

Proposal: - Demolition of existing detached dwelling and erection of 2 x semi-detached 3-bed dwellings to include accommodation at basement and loft levels (revised application).

Object: -

Members acknowledged that the ridge height has been reduced but agreed that little else has changed since the last application. Thus: -

- a) As a result of the revised lower ridge height, the large dormer window at the back would appear to exceed more than 60% of the roof surface. This would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, section 6, f: -
'Dormers should be as small as possible and should generally be located within the rear roof slope. As a general rule, the Council will resist dormers that take up more than 60% of the roof face.'**
- b) The proposal would breach the two metre (to the boundary) rule.**
- c) Also, the proposal breaches the 45-degree angle rule at the back.**
- d) Furthermore, the proposed development would not comply with policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Plan, for the following reasons: -**
 - 1) It would not recognise and complement the particular local character of the area in which it is located,**
 - 2) It would not respect, enhance or improve the visual amenity of the area by virtue of its scale, mass, bulk, height, urban form; and**
 - 3) It would have a significant negative impact on the amenity of neighbours, in terms of outlook and privacy.**
- e) The front of the proposed houses will be dominated by hardstanding for car parking. This would not comply with**



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D, section 2, c, k which states that buildings should not be separated from the street solely by areas of hard-standing such as car parking and that car parking should not dominate building frontages.

For the above reasons, the development does not accord with the design principles set out in 'The Radlett Design Code' of the emerging Radlett Neighbourhood Plan.

Members would like to request that a Hertsmere Borough Councillor call this application in to Committee.

20/1283/FUL Haberdashers Askes Boys School Butterfly Lane Elstree

Proposal: - Alterations to specific sections of a listed terracotta wall to include associated connected paths and terrace steps within the grounds of The Haberdashers Askes School.

The proposals covered in this application include:

No.1. A new opening within Bay 116 to connect the Boys' and Girls' Schools with associated new path and terrace steps;

No.2. Revised Proposals for Bays 138-149 inclusive.

No objection.

20/1199/FUL Haberdashers Askes Boys School Butterfly Lane

Proposal: - Erection of a Pre-Preparatory School building and re-purposing of the Round House lodge building with associated external play areas, landscaping and reconfiguration and extension of the Butterfly Lane car parking area.

No objection.

20/1272/FUL St John The Baptist Church, Church Lane, Aldenham

Proposal: - Installation of 2 x 2.2m high lamps in the Churchyard to illuminate the path to the North doors of the Church.

No objection.

20/1312/FUL Home Farm, Aldenham Road, Elstree

Proposal: - Erection of a yoga tent for a temporary period of two years.

No objection.