

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.

20/0377/PD42 31 Homefield Road

Proposal: - Single storey rear extension. Depth - 7.43m Height - 3m, Eaves - 2.6m

20/0408/CLP 14 The Ridgeway

Proposal: - Construction of single storey rear extension to include insertion of 3 x rear roof lights and alterations to fenestration. Certificate of Lawful Development (proposed).

Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

The following application was approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: - 20/0166/HSE 18 Folly Close (APC - No objection with condition and comment)

The following application was refused by Hertsmere Borough Council: - 20/0149/HSE 8 Park Road (APC – No objection with a condition)

The following applications have gone to appeal: -19/1615/HSE 1 Medburn Cottages, Watling Street, Elstree (APC – No objection) 19/1616/HSE 2 Medburn Cottages, Watling Street, Elstree (APC – No objection)

The following application has been withdrawn: -20/0218/FUL Stile Gate, Pegmire Lane, Aldenham (APC – No objection) 20/0140/FUL 7 Mornington Road (APC – Objected)

Date of next meeting/list

The next Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday 20th April 2020 but this may be in the form of a list to look at individually (like this week) and then sending in your comments and observations.

Planning Applications

Planning applications considered on 6th April 2020

20/0356/HSE 8 Orchard Close

Proposal: - Single storey rear and side extension and erection of front porch **No objection**



20/0348/HSE 11 Regents Close

Proposal: - Demolition of existing side extension and construction of a two storey side and a part single/part two storey rear extension. Conversion of loft to habitable room with front and rear dormers and rooflights to front, side and rear elevations.

Object: -

- The proposal would be out of keeping with the rest of the street which has its own particular style
- The bulk and mass of this extension will have an adverse effect on the street scene and be out of character with neighbouring properties.
- The crown roof would be bigger than the previous one and there are none in road
- It would result in overdevelopment of plot
- The rear dormers at 3rd floor level may give rise to overlooking.
- There may be a possible breach of the 45 degree rule with number 12.
- The dormer window in the roof space, on the front elevation, is contrary to Hertsmere's guidelines.
- There is concern whether there would be adequate off street parking provision.
- There may be a possible breach of Hertsmere Planning & Design Guide E, EKP-1 para 3.d,e,f, due to the 4.5m rearward projection of the 1st floor external wall of a dressing room. This appears to infringe a 45° line from rear windows of 12 Regents Close, which the architect's 45° line does do not appear to show accurately.

20/0367/HSE 5 The Grove

Proposal: - Single storey rear extension with 2 roof lights, two storey side extension with integral garage and alterations to fenestration **Objection with observations**

- It does not enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- Flat roof out of keeping
- It is not clear why the 2-storey element has a flat roof, rather than a matching pitched tiled design. This may be in breach of Hertsmere Planning & Design Guide E, page E-6 paras k, & l, the Council will resist a flat roof.
- There are TPO's on some trees on this plot therefore an arboriculture report should also be submitted.



- The Heritage advice from Place Services has said that there is not enough information or pictures. Trees need consideration by the Tree officer. A Heritage statement should be required and submitted.
- The proposal would be in breach of Hertsmere Planning & Design Guide E, EKP-1 para 3.d,e,f, due to the 4.5m rearward projection of the 1st floor external wall of a dressing room. This appears to infringe a 45° line from rear windows of 12 Regents Close, which the architect's 45° line does do not appear to show accurately.
- The extension at first floor level does not appear to comply with the 2 metre rule.

20/0380/HSE 1 The Close

Proposal: - Conversion of loft to habitable room with associated roof alterations to include rear dormer and insertion of front and side roof lights. **No objection**

20/0402/HSE 39 Beech Avenue

Proposal: - Partial conversion of garage to habitable space and first floor side extension.

No objection

20/0384/FUL 38-40 Watling St

Proposal: - Redevelopment of site comprising re-use and extension of 2 semi-detached former cottages, construction of 2 detached buildings to create a further 4×2 bed $\& 1 \times 3$ bed dwellings.

Generally, members had no major objections as the development creates needed smaller dwellings and the design seems less dense than previous applications presented, with slightly more amenity space. Also, the Heritage Officer appears to approve. However, Members raised a few concerns as follows: -

- The proposed rear building appears to be on the boundary and the height of it may be a concern as this development is in a Conservation Area.
- The side-facing first floor balconies and windows, particularly in the proposed new middle and rear buildings may give rise to overlooking the neighbouring properties.
- The number of parking spaces may not be sufficient.
- It may be overdevelopment of the plot although the scale of the scheme is less dense than previous schemes, the proposed amenity space is still minimal.

20/0410/HSE 2 Church Farm Cottages Church Lane Aldenham



Proposal: - Conversion of loft to habitable room and construction of single storey side extension to include insertion of rear roof lights, alterations to fenestration and associated landscaping.

No objection

20/0426/HSE 16 Aldenham Ave

Proposal: - Construction of single storey rear extension and first floor side extension to include alterations to fenestration. **Object:** -

• The proposed first floor level above the existing garage does not comply with the 2 metre distance from the boundary with the neighbour.

20/0420/HSE 5 Upper Station Road

Proposal: - Conversion of loft to habitable room to include rear dormer and insertion of 2 x roof lights to front elevation.

No objection

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: -

- This site is in a Conservation Area opposite 2 locally listed buildings, numbers 2 and 4 Loom Lane on a prominent corner plot, visible from Loom Lane and Cobden Hill
- The proposed houses would not be sympathetic to the Arts and Crafts design in the road. 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.
- 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.
- Many of the photographs of other houses in Loom Lane, that have been included in the Design and Access Statement, do not fall in the Conservation Area and are therefore not subject to the same restrictions as 1 Loom Lane.



- The proposed replacement houses look quite modern, and as such would not be of a suitable design
- The two houses are positioned far too close together with less than the required 2 metre gap between the boundaries. The 2.15-metre spacing between dwellings ought to be unacceptable, considering the prevailing spaciousness in the Conservation Area.
- The proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site. The two properties, although smaller than those in the previous application, are too big in relation to the plot. Each house is a minimum of 75 square metres bigger than the current house and all outbuildings. They fill the plot width to width. The size of the gardens would be disproportionate to the size of the houses for that road.
- There would be a significant loss of habitation and trees. This application omits to include a tree plan, which may be necessary to make a decision, given that there are trees with TPOs which may be affected by building a basement.
- Noting that the area of the site is 0.25Ha, where is the affordable element?
- Members would point out that the plot is not a rectangle as stated in the Design and Access Statement but tapers towards the back.

20/0429/HSE 28 The Crosspath

Proposal: - First floor side extension and alterations to facade **Object:** -

- The proposed first floor side extension (above the garage) would be less than 2 metres away from the boundary,
- The proposed extension, on this site, would give the impression of a very cramped and over developed site.
- The proposal would only have three 3 parking spaces for a five bedroomed property.
- For the above reasons, this planning application would not fully comply with SADM30.

Aldenham Parish Council The Radlett Centre, 1 Aldenham Ave. Radlett, Herts. WD7 8HL Tel: 01923 856433 Email: manager@aldenham-pc.gov.uk