

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 6th July 2020 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using www.zoom.us -- meeting ID: 845 3388 7804.

Present: Cllrs M Cherry (Chairman), E Samuelson, A Rubinson and J Lefton.

Officer: P Paley (Planning Officer)

There was also one member of the public.

225. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllr S Khawaja and G Taylor (co-opted member).

226. 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 nonpecuniary interests they have in any matter to be considered at this meeting.

Cllr J Lefton declared a non-pecuniary interest in planning application numbers 20/0422/FUL 1 Loom Lane and 20/0830/VOC 6 Loom Lane.

227. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 15th June 2020

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

228. 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 20/0840/FUL 31 Beech Avenue.

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

229. For information only.

Site reference: - Aldenham Country Park, Aldenham Road, Elstree, Borehamwood, WD6 3BA (LIQ/638)

The premises licence application, for the above site, that was submitted on 2nd June 2020 has been withdrawn by the applicant CARVIEW20. This was noted.



230. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

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

20/0532/HSE Phillimore House, Watling Street, Elstree (APC - No objection with condition)

20/0555/HSE 9 Aldenham Ave (APC – Objected)

20/0443/FUL 14 Letchmore Heath (APC – Objected)

20/0627/HSE 26 Newlands Avenue (APC - No objection)

20/0500/HSE 9 Hawthorne Road (APC - No objection with condition)

20/0416/HSE 29 Elm Walk (APC – No objection)

19/0837/VOC 12 Watford Road (APC - No objection with condition)

20/0598/HSE 54 Gills Hill Lane (APC – Objected)

The following application has gone to appeal: - 19/1867/FUL 12 Homefield Road (APC – Objected)

231. Date of next meeting

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday 20th July 2020

232. Planning Applications

There being no further business th	e meeting closed at 3.45pm.
Chairman	Date

Planning applications discussed at meeting on 6th July 2020

20/0691/FUL Aldenham Golf and Country Club, Church Lane, Aldenham

Proposal: - Installation of a disabled access ramp to the club house. **No objection**

20/0859/FUL Aldenham Golf And Country Club Church Lane Aldenham Watford

Proposal: - Installation of temporary covered walkway and covered outdoor seating area.

Members had no objection as long as it is only for five months.

20/0804/ADV 114-116 Watling St

Proposal: - Installation of 2 x sets of externally illuminated fascia signs and 1×1 x externally illuminated projection sign. (Application for Advertisement Consent).

No objection

20/0832/HSE 95 Newberries Avenue



Proposal: - Single storey and part first floor side extension Members had no objections but did note that the extension breaches the two metre (to the boundary) rule.

20/0789/HSE 421 Watling Street

Proposal: - Front garden works to include raising the levels, dropped kerb, installation of car turning table and associated boundary treatment.

No objection.

20/0830/VOC 6 Loom lane

Proposal: - Application for variation of condition 8 (Plans) to allow for a reduction in floor space and moving the indoor pool from the basement to the ground floor, following grant of planning permission: 18/2245/FUL.

Members had no objection subject to the inclusion of suitable screening to lessen the impact from the viewpoint of Church Field. Also, members suggest that future permitted development rights be removed.

20/0422/FUL 1 Loom Lane

Proposal: - Demolition of existing house and outbuildings to facilitate construction of 2 x dwellings (1 x 4 bed & 1 x 5 bed) to include accommodation at basement level with associated landscaping and parking (revised application to 18/2261/FUL).

Object: -

- a) NPF para 127 states that developments must add to the overall quality of the area by being visually attractive and sympathetic to the local character and history. They neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to the NPPF Policies SP1, CS14 and CS22, and SADM 29 and 30.
- b) This site and house fall in the Conservation Area and as such there are no special circumstances to justify the demolition of the existing property. The absence of any reference to SADM29 Heritage Assets would raise questions about whether or not the dwelling is uneconomic to repair or not. No evidence has been provided of this. Furthermore, the house is being lived in so is still in a habitable state.
- c) The two houses are positioned far too close together with less than the required 2 metre gap between the boundaries.
- d) The proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site.
- e) The proposal would result in the houses being proud of the existing building line and would not be in keeping with the street scene.
- f) Members would question whether there is adequate car parking for the two houses as it does not appear to meet the design guide standards.



- g) The scale and form of the two proposed houses are too bulky and will have a significant impact on the Conservation Area from the Cobden Hill entrance in to Loom Lane.
- h) The proposal would have a significant negative impact on the trees at the site through their removal, pruning and works within RPA's. This would also include the loss of trees with T.P.O.s.

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

20/0842/FUL Bhaktivedanta Manor, Dharam Marg, Hilfield Lane Aldenham

Proposal: - Rebuilding of hay barn.

No objection

20/0840/FUL 31 Beech Avenue

Proposal: - Demolition of existing detached dwelling and erection of 2 \times semi-detached 4- bed dwellings to include accommodation at basement and loft levels.

Object: -

- a) The proposal would breach the two metre (to the boundary) rule.
- b) Also, the proposal breaches the 45-degree angle rule at the back.
- c) 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.
- d) The ridge height of the proposed houses is higher than the neighbours. This does not comply with the guidelines set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D, section 2, c, i which states that new buildings should respect the height and building envelope of existing buildings within the vicinity.
- e) The front of the proposed houses will be dominated by hardstanding for car parking. This would not comply with 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.

20/0906/FUL Slades Farm Butterfly Lane Elstree

Proposal: - Construction of a general purpose agricultural building.

Object: -

Members agreed that the siting of the proposed barn is not appropriate and that it should be more integrated with the rest of the farm buildings.

Also, members suggest that suitable screening should be included in the proposal to lessen the visual impact of the large barn. Furthermore, members agreed that a transport assessment should be provided by the applicant.