

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> January 2021 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using <u>'Zoom' meeting website</u> -- meeting ID: 828 7157 2984

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

Officer: P Paley (Planning Officer)

#### 334. Apologies for absence

An apology was received from Cllr J Lefton.

- **335.** Declarations of interest on any item on the Agenda. None.
- 336. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2021

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

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

  There were no members of the public.
- 338. 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.

#### 20/2094/CLP Phillimore House Watling Street Elstree

**Proposal:** - Installation of swimming pool and construction of pool house. Certificate of Lawful Development (Proposed).

#### 20/2132/CLP 79 Newberries Ave

**Proposal:** - Conversion of loft to habitable room with hip to gable roof alterations, rear dormer and front roof light. Certificate of Lawful Development (proposed).

## 20/2119/LBC Edge Grove School, High Cross, Aldenham

**Proposal:** - Erection of a replacement rear extension and internal reconfiguration and alterations to existing stable block building. (Application for Listed Building Consent).

#### 21/0001/PD42 4 Rendlesham Ave

**Proposal: -** Single storey rear extension: Depth - 6m, Height - 3.5m, Eaves - 3m



These were noted.

## 339. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

The following applications were approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: - 20/1806/HSE Kitwell House, 36 The Warren (APC – No objection with comments)

20/1265/FUL Spylaw House, Newlands Ave (APC – Objected)

20/1810/FUL 42 The Ridgeway (APC – No objection with comments)

20/1280/HSE 1 Gills Hill (APC – No objection with comment)

20/1798/HSE 8 Medow Mead (APC - No objection with condition)

20/1765/HSE 54 Williams Way (APC - Objected)

20/1826/FUL 31 The Avenue (APC – Objected)

20/1709/HSE 9 The Heath (APC - Objected)

20/1471/VOC 50 Newlands Ave (APC – Comments made and a condition)

The following application was refused by Hertsmere Borough Council: - 20/1659/FUL Flat 2, 8 Hawtrees (APC – No objection with a condition and No objection – two meetings)

The following application has gone to appeal: - 20/1093/HSE Primrose Cottage, Common Lane, Letchmore Heath (APC – No objection)

The following application has been withdrawn: - 20/1688/FUL 58 Watford Road (APC – Objected)

#### 340. Date of next meeting

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> February 2021.

## 341. Planning Applications

There being no further business the n	neeting closed at 3.45pm.
Chairman	Date

# <u>Planning applications discussed at meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2021</u> 20/2048/HSE 4 Red Lion Close Aldenham

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing garage, erection of 2 storey side and single storey front extension with relocated entrance.

Members had no objection to the application subject to an appropriate arboricultural report being supplied, if appropriate. Also, members would recommend a condition be imposed to ensure that the bathroom windows, in the flank wall, be made of obscure glass.



## 20/2109/HSE 35 Willow Way

**Proposal:** - Two storey side and part single/part two storey rear extensions to include changes to fenestration. Conversion of loft to habitable room with rear dormer.

## Object: -

- a) The proposal will result in overdevelopment of the plot which would not comply with policy SADM of the 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 distance to the boundary of the proposed extensions, at first floor level, is too tight. This would not satisfy the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 4 k: -
  - 'Proposals in these areas should ensure that two storey side extensions should be located a minimum of 2 metres away from the side boundary.'
  - The distance to the boundary at ground floor level is also too tight. It would not satisfy the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 2 e: -
  - 'In locations where there is a significant separation between buildings this should be retained. As such single storey side extensions should be located a minimum of 1 metre away from the side boundary.'
- c) The proposed rear dormer is too big and would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 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.'

Members would like to confirm that there would be sufficient parking for a five bedroomed house.

#### 20/2131/HSE 79 Newberries Ave

**Proposal:** - Part-conversion of garage to habitable room, roof alterations, and changes to fenestration.

Members had no objection to this proposal. Although, members would strongly object to the application along the lines of application number 20/2132/CLP for this property.

20/2138/HSE 2 Gills Hill Lane



**Proposal:** - Two storey front and rear extensions to include new front porch, 1 no. roof light to side elevation, and an application of render to all elevations. Revised Application.

No objection.

## 20/1814/FUL 2 Station Road

**Proposal:** - Replacement of flat roof, replacement of timber cladding with matching brick and installation of 2 x windows to side elevation.

No objection.

## 20/2111/OUT 72 Newberries Ave

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing house and erection of a replacement 6 bed dwelling. (Outline Application with all matters reserved).

Object: -

- a) Members believe that the proposed new house would be too large for the plot. As such it would not comply with policy SADM 30 of the 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 house includes a large crown roof which is not in line with Council guidelines as: -
  - 'they tend to add considerable bulk and are out of keeping with the character of a street scene'
- c) The proposed new build would be too far forward of the building line and members would question whether the space left for cars would meet current car parking standards.
- d) Also, members would question how this area in front of the house will be re-landscaped as the redevelopment of the site will involve a significant loss of trees. The outline planning application does not show the disappearance of the lawn. It is important to retain a green frontage so that the verdant nature of the street scene is preserved.

## **20/2144/HSE 4 Watling St**

**Proposal: -** Single storey rear extension and conversion of garage to habitable room with change in garage door to window

Members had no objection to the application but would like confirmation that the car parking standards will be met as there will no longer be a garage. Also, this house is on a busy main road and the reduction in parking may affect the safe entry and exit of cars from the property.



#### 20/2165/HSE 6 Kitswell Way

**Proposal: -** Single storey rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable room and erection of porch

Members had no objections to the application but suggest that the front porch should be altered to be more in keeping with other houses in the road. Some form of pitch may resolve this concern.

#### 21/0038/HSE 56 Craigweil Ave

**Proposal:** - Conversion of garage to habitable room, single storey rear extension and conversion of loft to habitable room with rear dormer and 3 roof lights

## Object: -

- a) The rear dormer does not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 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) Also, due to the tapering nature of the gardens, the dormer would give rise to overlooking the garden of number 58 Craigweil Avenue which would have a negative effect on the privacy that they presently enjoy.
- c) Members would also question whether the current car parking standards will be met with the increase in the size of the house.

#### 20/0013/HSE 20 Homefield Road

**Proposal:** - The installation of an electronic entrance gate, brick piers and hedging along the frontage (revised application).

## Object: -

Members object to this proposal on the grounds that it is not a feature of Homefield Road. A previous application, number 20/1344/HSE, was a proposal for smaller gates but was refused. Our previous objections still apply and are as follows: - Object: -

a) The proposed entrance gate is not typical of this street which has open or green frontages. A similar application was refused and dismissed at appeal at 16 Williams Way in Radlett (application number 16/1485/HSE). Like Williams Way, Homefield Road is also a road characterized by open driveways. In his reasons given to dismiss that appeal, the Inspector had agreed that the application would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 7, k: -

'At 7.k the Council's Planning and Design Guide SPD 2006 (Part E) sets out that where gates are exceptionally granted due to the particular circumstances of an individual property they should,



amongst other matters, be well-screened and not dominate the streetscene.'

Furthermore, the Inspector gave considerable weight to policy SADM 30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Plan in his reasons to dismiss the appeal: -

'Amongst other things policy SADM30 states that development will be permitted provided it recognises and complements the particular local character of the area. That is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements at section 7 to reinforce local distinctiveness and respond to local character,'

The Inspector had stated that the scheme, which had been proposed at 16 Williams Way, would conflict with the guidance given above. Lastly, his conclusion was: -

'Given the significant harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.'

Just like the proposal at 16 Williams Way, the gated style of frontage, proposed in this application at 20 Homefield Road, would not fit in with the street scene and would harm the character of the area.

- b) This proposal does not respond positively to local townscape and landscape character. It would not therefore accord with policy HD3 of the emerging Radlett Neighbourhood Plan (subject to a referendum) and should not be supported.
- c) Also, the location of the proposed gate is right on the boundary which does not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 7, k which states that gates: -

'should be set back from the street'

20/2068/VOC Former Abbeyfield Care Home, 1-3 The Drive, Radlett

**Proposal:** Application for variation of condition 2 (plans) to allow for alterations to fenestration, air vents, parking layout, refuse area, bike storage, terrace, ground levels and basement structure following grant of planning permission 20/0225/FUL.

No comment.

#### 20/2133/VOC 6 Loom Lane

**Proposal:** Application for variation of Condition 8 (Plans) to allow for a lowered ground floor level and changes to fenestration following grant of planning permission 18/2245/FUL.

No comment.

20/2147/FUL Hilfield Farm, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham



**Proposal:** Demolition of 2  $\times$  storage units and erection of single storey warehouse to facilitate 5  $\times$  storage units and toilet facilities with associated parking.

No comment.