



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 18th May 2020 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using www.zoom.us -- meeting id 894 2598 4754.

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

There were also two members of the public.

Officer: P Paley (Planning Officer)

197. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllrs P De Skuba and S Khawaja.

198. 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.

All Councillors declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application number 20/0616/FUL, Land rear of 5 – 23 Cobden Hill, as the adjacent land is owned by Aldenhams Parish Council.

Cllr A Rubinson declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application number 20/0627/HSE, 26 Newlands Ave, as her house backs on to the application site.

199. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 4th May 2020

The minutes were confirmed by Cllr E Samuelson as a true record of this meeting.

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

Cllr E Samuelson suspended standing orders and invited the members of the public to speak.

One member of the public spoke regarding planning application number 20/0616/FUL, Land rear of 5 – 23 Cobden Hill.

One member of the public spoke regarding planning application number 20/0623/HSE, 45 Homefield Road.

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



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

201. 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.

20/0587/CLP 16 Peregrine Close

Proposal: - Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension and front porch. Certificate of lawfulness (proposed)

This was noted.

202. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

The following applications had been approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: -

20/0348/HSE 11 Regents Close (APC – Objected)

20/0154/HSE 54 Newberries Ave (APC – Objected) (APC – No comments in quorate)

20/0231/HSE Adelaide Lodge, High Cross, Aldenham (APC – No objection)

20/0356/HSE 8 Orchard Close (APC – No objection)

20/0380/HSE 1 The Close (APC – No objection)

20/0402/HSE 39 Beech Ave (APC – No objection)

20/0087/VOC 50 Newlands Ave (APC – No objection with comment)

20/0420/HSE 5 Upper Station Road (APC – No objection)

20/0426/HSE 16 Aldenham Ave (APC – Objected)

20/0161/HSE 1 Homefield Road (APC – No objection with comment)

20/0439/HSE 35 Gills Hill (APC – No objection)

The following application had been refused by Hertsmere Borough Council: -
20/0429/HSE 28 The Crosspath (APC – Objected)

203. Date of next meeting

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday
1st June 2020

204. Planning Applications

There being no further business the meeting closed at 3.35pm

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

Planning applications discussed at meeting on 18th May 2020

20/0495/HSE 4 Grove Cottages Hogg Lane Elstree

Proposal: - Erection of detached, single storey outbuilding to rear garden for disabled care

Object: -

a) The application is for a very large outbuilding to serve as annexe accommodation. An outbuilding of this type and size does not



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

comply with the guidelines set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, para 9,a, accommodation of this type, *'must be modest in size and scale'*.

- b) Also, the unit is completely self-contained and separate from the main dwelling. It is, in effect, back garden development. Again, it does not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, para 9, a, as annexe accommodation it, *'should not have a separate entrance or staircase. The extension should be internally connected to the rest of the house.'*
- c) The application site is next to the Green Belt. The advice from the National Planning Policy Framework is that, *'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.'* (NPPF para 143)
Furthermore,
'A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt.' (NPPF para 145)
No special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify a building of this size and type next to Green Belt land.
- d) The proposed location of the outbuilding is too close to the boundary and the ridge height of the roof is too high. It is visible from the Green Belt and the adjacent public footpath.

The Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, para 9,a, concludes that,
'The development of large self-contained flats as granny annexe or staff accommodation extensions will not be permitted.'

Members added that, if the Planning Officer is minded to approve this application, it should be amended so that it is not split from the main dwelling in order to comply with Hertsmere's guidelines.

20/0416/HSE 29 Elm Walk

Proposal: - Conversion of garage to habitable room and construction of single storey side extension to include insertion of roof light to front elevation and alterations to fenestration.

No objection.

20/0541/FUL Land at Ham Farm Stables, Hogg Lane, Elstree

Proposal: - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2 x 4-bed semi-detached houses and associated landscaping.

Members had no objections to the design of the proposed houses which they agreed was sympathetic to Ham Farm House but have concerns which match those of the Highways Authority in respect of the sustainability of the proposal.



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

20/0608/FUL 84 Watling St

Proposal: - Change of use of ground floor from financial/professional services (A2) to residential (C3), including changes to the fenestration to create 1 x 1-bed and 1 x 2-bed flats.

Members had no objections subject to the view of the Heritage Officer.

20/0598/HSE 54 Gills Hill Lane

Proposal: - Erection of a part single part two storey rear extension with external alterations and addition of front porch roof

Object: -

- a) **The proposed single storey extension would breach the 45-degree rule with the adjoining property.**
- b) **Also, the rearside part of the single storey extension is too close to the boundary of the adjoining property. This would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, para. 2, e: - 'single storey side extensions should be located a minimum of 1 metre away from the side boundary.'**

20/0616/FUL Land rear of 5 – 23 Cobden Hill

Proposal: - Alterations to No 15 Cobden Hill to include removal of side extension to facilitate a new vehicular access for the development comprising the construction of 8 x 3 bed dwellings, on land to the rear.

Object: -

- a) **This proposal is for eight houses in the back gardens of eight existing houses which are situated in the Conservation Area and over-looking Green Belt land.**

Back land development of this kind can have a negative impact on the character of an area. Garden land is not now considered as previously developed land so is not automatically acceptable for development (the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D 2e) 'Garden Land Development'. The nearby Mews development cannot be used as a comparison as these four mews houses were built on previously developed land which was originally the site of a school.

The Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D 2 E), para d, does not support development in the form of a tandem development layout such as this proposal,

'certain forms of garden land development are generally out of character with the surrounding area, and do not compliment or respect existing patterns of development. These include 'tandem developments' (also known as two tier developments) and other forms of backland development such as the assembly of multiple back gardens will be discouraged as they are unlikely to respect the character of an area.'



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

- b) The development will be accessed through a single narrow roadway. There is no provision for a footway. This does not comply with the guidelines set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D 2e), para w,
'the Council will normally view several houses being accessed off of a single, narrow road as unacceptable. The safety of non-motorised road users, including pedestrians, should be prioritised and footways provided on access roads and drives.'
Ideally, a shared access road would serve no more than five dwellings whereas this development would have eight dwellings.
- c) The site of the new development is on the boundary with the Green Belt and will be visible from this open land. This will have an adverse effect on the amenity value of the nearby houses and also that of the Green Belt land.
- d) To make way for the new development approximately fifty-four trees will have to be removed. This would not comply with Policy SADM 11, para 4.11 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Plan,
'It is expected that any healthy, high quality trees on a development site will be retained.'
In addition, Policy SADM 12 states that: -
'Planning permission will be refused for development which would result in the loss, or likely loss, of:
(i) healthy, high quality trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order; or
(ii) any healthy, high quality trees and/or hedgerows that make a valuable contribution to the amenity or environment of the area in which they are located.'
These trees make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.
- e) Number 15 Cobden Hill will suffer a loss of amenity space as the proposal includes a plan to demolish the side of the house to accommodate the new access road.

20/0623/HSE 45 Homefield Road

Proposal: - Two storey front extension, part single/two storey rear extension, first floor side extension and construction of new roof with habitable accommodation to include 3 x rear dormers and 4 x rooflights.

Object: -

- a) The proposal will result in overdevelopment of the plot in terms of height, mass and bulk. This would not comply with policy SADM30 of Hertsmere's 'Site Allocations and Development Management Plan': -
'In order to achieve a high quality design, a development must:



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

- (i) respect, enhance or improve the visual amenity of the area by virtue of its scale, mass, bulk, height, urban form;*
- b) The proposal includes two crown roofs. This would not be in line with Hertsmere's guidelines as set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, EKP -5: -
'The Council will normally resist extensions that result in crown roofs, as they tend to add considerable bulk and are out of keeping with the character of a street scene.'
Also, the addition of crown roofs would not comply with the guidelines as set out in 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.'
- c) The three dormers will give rise to overlooking the neighbouring houses and the neighbours in Loom Lane. This would not comply with policy SADM30 of Hertsmere's 'Site Allocations and Development Management 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) As well as the excessive bulk created by the proposed extensions, members noted that the finished house will be too close to the boundary with number 43 Homefield Road. Also, this plot is smaller than the neighbour's plots.
- e) The proposal may breach the 45-degree angle with the neighbours property. This would not accord with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E, para. 3.f: -
'Two storey and first floor rear extensions should be sensitively positioned and designed. In all cases, the first floor of a rear extension should be set comfortably within a line drawn at 45 degrees from the nearest edge of any first floor neighbouring window'

20/0627/HSE 26 Newlands Ave

Proposal: - Erection of two single storey extensions to rear of property linked by existing canopy roof, with one creating a cover seated area.

No objection.