



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2021 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using ['Zoom' meeting website](#) -- meeting ID:821 7971 7104.

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

Officer: Peter Evans (Parish Council Manager)

There were also two members of the public.

### **327. Apologies for absence**

An apology was received from Cllr S Khawaja.

### **328. 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.**

Cllr M Cherry declared a pecuniary interest in planning application number, 20/1983/VOC 38 - 40 Watling Street, as he owns the property.

All members declared a pecuniary interest in planning application number 20/2066/FUL, Site At Scrubbitts Wood Gills Hill, as Aldenham Parish Council own the property.

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

### **329. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 21st December 2020**

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

### **330. 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.

Both members of the public chose to observe.

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

### **331. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council**

The following applications were approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: -  
20/1723/HSE Moat House, The Warren (APC – No objection)  
20/1671/FUL Elangeni, Loom Lane (APC – No objection with comment)



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

### 332. Date of next meeting

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> January 2021.

### 333. Planning Applications

There being no further business the meeting closed at 3.47pm.

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

#### **Planning applications discussed at meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2021**

##### **20/2032/HSE 11 Regents Close**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of rear pool house and erection of single storey rear extension with flat roof, first floor side and rear extension to include creation of rear roof terrace, roof alterations, changes to fenestration and relocated entrance.

**In principle, members had no objection to this application but had concerns regarding overlooking of neighbours from the balcony. This feature would not meet the guidelines set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 3, l: -**

***'The use of a flat roof (or section of roof) as a balcony, roof terrace or garden is likely to harm the privacy and amenity of neighbours and will be refused permission or controlled by a planning condition.'***

##### **20/2023/FUL Bio Products Laboratory, Dagger Lane, Elstree**

**Proposal:** - Construction of single storey extension to existing manufacturing building No 27 with installation of new air handling units on the roof.

**In principle, members had no objection to this application but commented that it would need to comply with policy SADM 26 'Development Standards in the Green Belt' as the building is within the Green Belt.**

**Also, members requested that a condition be imposed to ensure that if any trees are removed they are replaced.**

##### **20/2027/HSE 37 Links Drive**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing side garage and outbuilding, construction of part single, part two storey side extension and alterations to fenestration.

**Object:** -

**The proposal would breach the two metre (to the boundary) rule at first floor level. This would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 4, k: -**



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

***'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. In some locations a greater distance may be more appropriate. The purpose of requiring separation between buildings is to retain views, openness (sky gaps), and to prevent extensions creating a terracing effect and resulting in a cramped form of development.'***

### **20/2052/HSE 25 Aldenham Avenue**

**Proposal:** - Construction of front porch (part-retrospective application).

**No objection**

### **20/2043/HSE 60 The Ridgeway**

**Proposal:** - Construction of part single, part two storey rear extension, single storey front extension to include integral garage and alterations to fenestration.

**Members still had concerns about the view of the extensions from Summerfield, a neighbouring house, otherwise members did not object to this application.**

### **20/2045/HSE Longwood 4 The Warren**

**Proposal:** - Creation of new window in porch (retrospective application).

**No objection**

### **20/2051/HSE Triangle Cottage Back Lane Letchmore Heath**

**Proposal:** - Construction of a single storey orangery to rear elevation.

**Object:** -

**Members agreed that this extension is too large in relation to the host building and the plot. In principal, an addition to the house is fine but not one of this size.**

### **20/1983/VOC 38 - 40 Watling Street**

**Proposal:** - Application for variation of condition 2 (plans) to allow for amendments to basement level following grant of planning permission 20/0384/FUL

**The application number 38-40 Watling St was discussed at the end of the meeting. Cllr M Cherry left the meeting before the discussion commenced.**

### **20/2054/FUL 20 Aldenham Avenue**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement two storey, 4 bed dwelling with integral garage at new lower ground level.

**Object:** -



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

The west boundary for the new build does not comply with the two metre (to the boundary) rule at first floor level as set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D para. 2, n, c: -

*'Proposals in areas where there is significant separation between buildings should ensure that all floors of buildings are located at least 2 metres away from the side boundary.'*

If minded to approve, members would request that a condition be imposed to ensure that the windows on the side elevation are made obscure glass.

### **20/2050/HSE Primrose Cottage Common Lane Letchmore Heath**

**Proposal:** - Single storey timber orangery

**No objection.**

### **20/2069/FUL 46 Newberries Avenue**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing house and erection of a detached, 6-bed dwelling with accommodation in the roof space, to include new patio and shed, and removal of dropped kerb and hardstanding to rear garden and replacement of boundary treatment.

**Object:** -

**a) The proposed new house would be too big and bulky on this plot and would be out of proportion in the street scene. Members disagreed with the concluding statement of the applicants Design and Access statement: -**

*'This proposal seeks to complement the existing grain, pattern and form of development. The dwelling will also seek to replicate the design in terms of scale, materials and appearance.'*

Members agreed that this statement could not be applied to the proposed development. It does not complement the street scene so would be in breach of Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan: -

*'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:*

*(i) respect, enhance or improve the visual amenity of the area by virtue of its scale, mass, bulk, height, urban form;'*

**b) The proposed new dwelling breaches the two metre (to the boundary) rule on both sides. This would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D para. 2 n) c**

*'Proposals in areas where there is significant separation between buildings should ensure that all floors of buildings are located at least 2 metres away from the side boundary.'*



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Also, this large new build would be on a prominent corner plot and would be close to the boundary with the pavement. The scale and footprint of the proposed house at this site would not comply with the guidelines, in respect of corner plots, as set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D para. 2 m) e: -

*'New homes developed on a corner plot with a road or footpath alongside it are likely to be visible from the public highway. In these circumstances, the development should be set back from the building line in each street, unless the prevailing pattern of development indicates otherwise.'*

Neither would it comply with para. 2 m) f, a further guideline in respect of corner plots: -

*'Proposals that would result in an unsympathetic or bulky addition to the street scene will be refused.'*

As this is a new development there is no reason for non-compliance with the guidelines in respect of boundary spacing.

This proposal does not adhere to or respect the Radlett Design Code which aims to protect and enhance Radlett's attractive characteristics. It would not comply with paras. 'a' to 'e' of section 3.46 of the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan.

*'a. Plot coverage. Achieving plot coverage that respects its surroundings.*

*b. Ridge height. Ensure that development takes account of gradients and restricts ridge heights to a height that respects neighbouring properties.*

*c. Gates. Ensuring that gates and entrances requiring planning permission respect local character and do not dominate their surroundings.*

*d. Front gardens. Ensuring that new homes are designed such that spaces in front of them contribute to the verdant character of the area. Ensuring that hard surface coverage within housing plots be limited and that hard surfacing be permeable.*

*e. Spacing between building and boundary (set-in) Providing sufficient space between dwellings.'*

### **20/2064/HSE 31 Craigweil Avenue**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing garage and rear extension and construction of part single/part two storey side and rear extensions. Conversion of loft to habitable room with side and rear dormers and construction of a new front porch.

**Object:** -

**a) The combination of the two metre (to the boundary) rule being breached at first floor level along with the side dormer to accommodate the staircase, gives the impression of an**



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

overdeveloped building. This would be in breach of Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan: -

*'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:*

*(i) respect, enhance or improve the visual amenity of the area by virtue of its scale, mass, bulk, height, urban form;'*

b) Members would also question whether there is adequate parking provision for the increased size of the building.

c) Also, the proposal does not show the 45degree line in relation to the first floor extension and the impact it may have on the adjoining neighbours.

### **20/2066/FUL Site At Scrubbitts Wood Gills Hill**

**Proposal:** - Alterations to existing staircase to include new hand rail at Gills Hill entrance.

**No comment.**

### **20/2072/HSE 15 Williams Way**

**Proposal:** - Construction of single storey rear extension

**Members had no objections to the application although we did note that it breaches the one metre (to the boundary) rule.**

### **20/1765/HSE 54 Williams Way**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing porch and roof alterations to include gable alterations and 1 front dormer and 2 rear dormers (Amended Plans Received 14/12/2020)

**Object:** -

**Members agreed that most of the previous comments still apply.**

**The proposal now includes a front dormer with a flat crown roof which is not in keeping with the street scene and would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 6g: -**

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

**Also, the changes to the bungalow would not comply with Policy HD7.1 of the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan: -**

***'HD7.1 Development proposals which impact on any of the Radlett Bungalows identified identified on Policy HD7 Map for their individual and group value in contributing positively to local townscape character should protect or enhance this contribution.'***

**As Cllr M Cherry had declared a pecuniary interest in the following application number 20/1983/VOC, he left the meeting, before the**



## **ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

**discussion of the application. Cllr E Samuelson took over as Chair of the meeting at this point.**

### **20/1983/VOC 38 - 40 Watling Street**

**Proposal:** - Application for variation of condition 2 (plans) to allow for amendments to basement level following grant of planning permission 20/0384/FUL

**Members had no objection to the application for a variation to condition 2 but hope that an efficient project management plan will be in place to minimise disruption, in the rush hour, on this main road.**