



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 1st February 2021 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using '[Zoom](#)' [meeting website](#) -- meeting ID: 82179717104

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

Officer: P Paley (Planning Officer)

There were also 36 members of the public.

342. Apologies for absence

All Councillors were present.

343. Declarations of interest on any item on the Agenda. None.

344. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 18th January 2021

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

345. 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 21/0055/HSE, The Fairways 4 Faggotts Close.

One member of the public spoke regarding planning application number 21/0150/HSE, 12 Canons Close.

One member of the public spoke regarding planning application number 20/1831/FUL, 11 The Rose Walk. Cllr M Cherry added that whilst we had not been reconsulted on the amended plans, it appeared that the new proposals had not changed significantly and that the previous comments would still stand.

Fifteen members of the public spoke regarding planning application number 21/0050/FULEI, Land North Of Butterfly Lane, Land Surrounding Hilfield Farm And Land West Of Hilfield Lane Aldenham (Renewable energy generating station.)

Eighteen members of the public chose to observe.

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

346. To discuss the following: -

The planning application number 21/0050/FULEI, in respect of the following proposal: -



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Proposal: - Installation of renewable led energy generating station comprising ground-mounted photovoltaic solar arrays and battery-based electricity storage containers together with substation, inverter/transformer stations, site accesses, internal access tracks, security measures, access gates, other ancillary infrastructure, landscaping and biodiversity enhancements.

The location of the above proposal: - Land North Of Butterfly Lane, Land Surrounding Hilfield Farm And Land West Of Hilfield Lane Aldenham Hertfordshire.

Members agreed that this proposal is of a highly technical nature and, if given consent, would have an immense effect on large areas of Green Belt land bordering several villages and schools. All points would need to be very carefully considered and assessed before issuing a response to the Local Planning Authority. Due to the complicated nature of this proposal, it was

Resolved

a) That the officer obtain at least two quotes for the services of a specialist planning consultant who could advise on the most appropriate course of action and help formulate a response to HertsmereBC.

b) That as the Planning Committee have no budget that the F&GP Committee include the fees for the consultant within the professional fees admin budget.

This planning application will be included in the agenda for the next planning meeting on 15th February.

347. 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.

21/0047/CLP 6 Hillside Road

Proposal: - Erection of rear outbuilding. Certificate of lawfulness (Proposed)

21/0124/CLP Little Orchard Watling Street

Proposal: - Demolition of numerous existing outbuildings and erection of detached rear outbuilding (use class E). Certificate of Lawful Development (Proposed).

348. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

The following applications were approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: -
20/1883/HSE 9 Folly Close (APC – No objection)
20/1949/HSE 6 Folly Pathway (APC – No objection)
20/1953/FUL Aldenham Golf And Country Club, Church Lane, Aldenham (APC – No objection)



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

20/1661/FUL 18 The Warren (APC – Objected)
20/0923/HSE The White House, Waterside (APC – No objection)
20/1779/FUL 58 Watling Street (APC – No objection with conditions)
20/1937/FUL Institute Of Grocery Distribution, Grange Lane, Letchmore Heath (APC – No objection)
20/2045/HSE Longwood, 4 The Warren (APC – No objection)

The following applications have been withdrawn: -

20/1795/FUL 70 Watling St (APC – Comments made)
20/1971/FUL Elstree Aerodrome, Hogg Lane, Elstree (APC – Objected)
20/1975/VOC 10 Aldenham Ave (APC – Objected)

349. Date of next meeting

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday 15th February 2021.

350. Planning Applications

There being no further business the meeting closed at 4.00pm.

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

Planning applications discussed at meeting on 1st February 2021

21/0044/HSE Hillside Cottage, Loom Lane

Proposal: - Installation of front boundary wall, brick piers and entrance gates.

No objection.

21/0055/HSE The Fairways 4 Faggotts Close

Proposal: - Demolition of garage and erection of a single storey side extension with 2 roof lights to rear and addition of porch

Object: -

Members applaud the retention of the bungalow but are objecting to the application as it would appear, from the plans, that the proposed bungalow roof, on the extension, would breach the one metre rule, 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.'

Members believe that there would be a loss of light to the dining room of the neighbouring property where a sole window affords light to this room.

21/0065/HSE 18 The Close



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Proposal: - Conversion of loft to habitable room, with change in roof shape from hipped to gable, dormer to rear and 4 roof lights to front

Members would normally object to this as it breaches several guidelines of the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E in respect of the large size of the dormer, the change from hip to gable roof shape and the front roof lights. However, as the property next door has been given consent for similar changes, members decided not to object.

Members would question whether there would be sufficient car parking for the increase in habitable rooms.

21/0073/HSE 1 The Woods

Proposal: - Single storey rear extension, construction of new front porch and insertion of 1 front roof light

No objection.

21/0013/HSE 20 Homefield Road

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

Object: -

As the plans have not changed since the last meeting, our comments remain the same: -

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: -



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

'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'

21/0101/VOC 9 Aldenham Ave

Proposal: - Application for variation of condition 5 to omit the need for an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan following grant of planning permission 20/0555/HSE

Object: -

Members agreed that it is important and appropriate to keep the condition as stated in the consent given for application number 20/0555/HSE. The variation of this condition should not be allowed. Members would draw attention to the section in the officers report which details the reasoning behind the need for an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan: -

'Trees, Landscape and Ecological Impact Policy SADM12 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan sets out the Council's requirements for trees and landscaping. Planning permission will be refused for development that would result in the loss or likely loss of healthy, high quality trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order; or otherwise any healthy, high quality trees and/or hedgerows that make a valuable contribution to the visual amenity or environment of their location. If any such loss would occur through approved development, replacement planting would be required. Additionally, Policy CS12 of the Hertsmere Local Plan



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Core Strategy states that all development proposals must conserve or enhance the natural environment of the Borough, including biodiversity, habitats, protected trees, landscape character, and sites of ecological and geological value. Regard is also given to policy HD6 of the RNP, which states that development proposals should retain healthy high quality trees, woodland and hedges. The application dwelling is not situated within a Conservation Area and there are no protected trees within or near the site. However, the Council's own policies in addition to the RNP states that healthy, high quality trees that contribute to the visual amenity of the area should be retained where possible. There are numerous mature trees along the front and side boundaries that are considered to make a positive contribution to the verdant character of the road, in addition to providing natural screening between the dwellings. The proposed site plan submitted shows the retention of the existing trees and hedgerow along the front boundary and multiple trees along the side boundary with No. 2 Christchurch Crescent, which is welcomed. The Tree Officer was consulted given the presence of numerous trees that are considered of high amenity value. It was advised that the proposed works, due to their proximity to the trees particularly on the side boundary, would likely have an adverse impact on these trees. It was therefore recommended that arboricultural documents be secured by condition to fully survey these trees and to establish which trees, if any, are to be removed or pruned and what protection measures would be employed for those trees to be retained. A pre-commencement condition is therefore attached to this grant of permission to ensure the protection of trees within and in proximity to the site.'

It is believed that removal and/or damage to trees may have already taken place. If that is the case, appropriate remedial measures should be taken.

21/0150/HSE 12 Canons Close

Proposal: - Conversion of garage to habitable room with change from garage door to window and porch to front. Two storey side and rear extension and conversion of loft to habitable room with 2 roof lights to sides and 2 pitched dormers to the rear

Object: -

- a) **Proposal would result in overdevelopment of the plot. This would not accord with the design principles set out in policy SADM 30.**

'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,'



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

- b) The boundary spacing of the proposals is inadequate. It fails to acknowledge the two metre (to the boundary rule). This would not comply with policy HD5, para e, of the Radlett Design Code from the emerging Radlett Neighbourhood Plan: -
'Spacing between the building and boundary shall be no less than 1m at ground floor level and a minimum of 2m for extensions which are 2 or more storeys'.
- c) The overdevelopment of the site is further exaggerated by the fact that the proposal includes a crown roof. This would not comply with 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.'
- d) Also, the rear dormers could give rise to overlooking which would have a negative effect on the privacy that neighbours currently enjoy. This would be in breach of Policy SADM 30: -
'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.'

21/0092/ADV 137 Watling Street

Proposal: - Installation of 1 x non-illuminated fascia sign (Application for Advertisement Consent).

No comment.

21/0100/FUL 289 Watling Street

Proposal: - Change of use from non-residential education centre (F1) to shop (E) at basement and ground floor levels and construction of a single storey front infill extension to include alterations to fenestration.

No comment.

21/0147/VOC Pheasants Retreat 10 New Road Letchmore Heath

Proposal: - Application for variation of Condition 5 (Plans) to allow for internal partitioning following grant of planning permission 19/0275/FUL

No comment.