



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 1st March 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: P Paley (Planning Officer)

There were also 6 members of the public.

360. Apologies for absence

An apology was received from Cllr S Khawaja.

361. 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 non-pecuniary interests they have in any matter to be considered at this meeting.

All Councillors declared a non pecuniary interest in planning application number, 20/0616/FUL Land Rear Of 5 To 23, Cobden Hill, as the site is located adjacent to land owned Aldenham Parish Council.

362. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 15th February 2021.

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

363. 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.

All members of the public chose to observe.

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

364. To discuss the following: -

a) The NALC consultation: PC2-21 | MODEL DESIGN CODE: - The rationale, proposals, specific questions, draft text updates to the NPPF and the annexed draft National Model Design Code are given [here](#). NALC seeks the views of member councils on the draft. The



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

main consultation questions to consider are detailed in a separate document.

Members agreed that the proposals appear to make sense but added that we may not be suitably qualified to give an informed viewpoint.

- b) The Hertfordshire County Council consultation on a new draft Waste Local Plan. The new Plan sets the vision, objectives and spatial strategy for waste planning in Hertfordshire up to 2036. The details of the draft plan are given here: -[Link to Draft Waste Local Plan](#)**

Members decided to defer discussion of this consultation until the next meeting.

365. 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.

21/0261/CLP 43 Gills Hill Lane

Proposal: - Conversion of loft to habitable room with hip to gable roof alterations, rear dormer, 3 x front roof lights and insertion of window to side elevation. Certificate of Lawful Development (Proposed).

This was noted.

366. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

The following applications were approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: -

- 20/2032/HSE 11 Regents Close (APC – No objection with concerns)
- 20/2012/HSE 5 Station Road (APC – No objection with concerns)
- 20/2138/HSE 2 Gills Hill Lane (APC – No objection)
- 20/2013/HSE 5 Station Road (APC – Objected)
- 20/2109/HSE 35 Willow Way (APC – Objected)
- 20/2064/HSE 31 Craigweil Ave (APC – Objected)
- 20/1967/VOC 121 Newberries Ave (APC – Objected)
- 20/1814/FUL 2 Station Road (APC – No objection)
- 20/1813/FUL 11 The Rose Walk (APC – Objected)
- 21/0013/HSE 20 Homefield Road (APC – Objected)
- 20/2131/HSE 79 Newberries Ave (APC – No objection with comment)
- 20/2144/HSE 4 Watling St (APC – No objection with concerns)
- 20/1725/HSE Moat House, The Warren (APC – No objection with a condition)
- 20/1983/VOC 38-40 Watling St (APC – No objection with comment)

The following applications have gone to appeal: -

- 20/1643/FUL 4 Hilfield Lane (APC – No comment)
- 20/0422/FUL 1 Loom Lane (APC – Objected)



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

367. Date of next meeting

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

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

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

368. Planning Applications

21/0260/FUL 57 Beech Avenue

Proposal: - Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of replacement 2 storey, detached, 4 bed dwelling to include associated landscaping, parking, bike store and bin store.

Object: -

- a) **The new dwelling breaches the two metre (to the boundary rule) on both sides. This would not accord with 'The Radlett Design Code, para e, of 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.'**
- b) **The proposed new dwelling features a large crown roof. This would not accord with the guidelines set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D para 9.4.2. h: - 'Crown roofs on residential properties, where they are visible from the street will not be considered acceptable as these tend to appear bulky or overbearing.'**
- c) **The new development will entail the loss of vegetation at the front of the property to accommodate the proposed hardstanding. This would not adhere to or respect the Radlett Design Code which aims to protect and enhance Radlett's attractive characteristics. It would not comply with para. 'd' of section 3.46 of the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan. '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.'**

Members wish to point out that boundary distances given in the Design and Access statement are incorrect.

Members were disappointed to see the loss of yet another bungalow in the RNP area.

21/0275/HSE 1 Gills Hill Lane



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Proposal: - First floor side extension over existing garage to include Juliet balcony at rear elevation.

Object: -

- a) The proposed Juliet balcony is likely to give rise to overlooking the neighbour's garden.
- b) Members also had concerns over the parking capacity for the increased size of the house.

Members would also like to see the submission of an arboricultural assessment as noted by the tree officer in his report.

21/0181/FUL 32 Shenley Hill

Proposal: - Demolition of existing house, construction of replacement detached 2 storey, 5 bed dwelling to include accommodation within the roof space and associated landscaping, parking and bin store.

Object: -

- a) The new dwelling would result in a significant breach of the two metre (to the boundary rule) at first floor level as it would be less than one metre to the boundary. This would not accord with 'The Radlett Design Code para e of 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.'
- b) There would also be a significant breach of the 45-degree rule at first floor level with number 30 Shenley Hill. The drawings show the ground floor but the first floor is further back leading to a significant breach.
- c) This would not therefore comply with Section 1, b of the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E.
'Rear extensions should be set comfortably within the line drawn at 45 degrees from the nearest edge of the neighbouring front or rear facing windows.'
- d) Proposal includes a large crown roof. This feature would not accord with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D section 2k, paragraph I: -
'Crown roofs can often appear bulky or overbearing, so should usually be avoided in residential developments.'
- e) The tarmac over the whole of the front garden would not comply with para. 'd' of section 3.46 of the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan.
'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.'



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Members were concerned that much of the vegetation has already been removed. If that is the case, this greenery should be reinstated.

21/0281/HSE Avenue Lodge The Avenue

Proposal: - Erection of a single-storey front extension; two storey side and two storey rear extension; conversion of the loft space to create 2 habitable rooms with 2 rear dormers; removal of a catslide roof to the front and replacement with a front gable (revised application 14/2039/HSE).

Object: -

a) The proposal will result in overdevelopment of this corner plot.

b) The proposed rear dormers would result in overlooking the neighbours in Lodge End.

The above proposed features would not comply with policy SADM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management 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; and

(ii) have limited impact on the amenity of occupiers of the site, its neighbours, and its surroundings in terms of outlook.'

c) Proposal includes a large crown roof. This feature would not accord with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D section 2k, paragraph I: -

'Crown roofs can often appear bulky or overbearing, so should usually be avoided in residential developments.'

Members agreed that the trees need to be retained and an arboricultural report should be submitted to accompany the application.

21/0288/HSE Holmesdale Common Lane

Proposal: - Demolition of detached garage and erection of two storey side extension

Members had no objection, in principal, to the proposed extension but agreed that the space for car parking needs to be adequate on site, without loss of greenery. Members would not want to see the whole frontage concreted over. The proposals need to be in line with the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan HD3.2, d: -

'Spaces in front of homes shall enhance and improve the verdant character of the local streetscape.'



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

21/0293/HSE 12 Gills Hill Lane

Proposal: - Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of outbuilding to rear.

Object: -

- a) **The proposed out building is far too big as an outbuilding in a domestic garden. Its footprint would be bigger than the host building and is more akin to a tandem building.**
- b) **The building is in breach of the one metre (to the boundary) rule: - policy HD5, para e, of the Radlett Design Code from the emerging Radlett Neighbourhood Plan states: - *'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'.***

Members noted that there are trees at the side of the proposed outbuilding and are concerned that these would be lost if permission is given for this application.

Members also added that if the officer is minded to grant consent it needs to be conditioned that the premises can't be used for commercial use such as a personal training studio or office building.

20/0616/FUL Land Rear Of 5 To 23, Cobden Hill,

Proposal: - Alterations to No 15 Cobden Hill; erection of 8 dwellings with garages and parking spaces; new vehicular and pedestrian access drive; landscaping and ancillary works. AMENDED PLAN RECEIVED 11 FEB 21

Object: -

Members agreed that their previous comments remain the same for this amended plan. Members also added that they do not think that the public benefit outweighs the harm as the developer has not shown the public benefit.

- a) **This would be an unsympathetic development in the grounds of locally listed buildings. Also, back land development, of this kind, can have a negative impact on the character of an area. Garden land is not now considered as previously developed land so is not automatically acceptable for development (the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D 2e) 'Garden Land Development'. The nearby Mews development cannot be used as a comparison as these four mews houses were built on previously developed land which was originally the site of a school. The Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D 2 E), para d, does not support development in the form of a tandem development layout such as this proposal, *'certain forms of garden land development are generally out of character with the surrounding area, and do not compliment or***



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

respect existing patterns of development. These include 'tandem developments' (also known as two tier developments) and other forms of backland development such as the assembly of multiple back gardens will be discouraged as they are unlikely to respect the character of an area.'

- b) This development does not enhance the Conservation Area and does not relate well to the locally listed buildings.
- c) Also, the application involves the partial removal of one of the locally listed buildings.
- d) The access road is too close to these buildings as it passes through the middle of two terraces. It is also a single narrow roadway. There is no provision for a footway. This does not comply with the guidelines set out in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D 2e), para w,
'the Council will normally view several houses being accessed off of a single, narrow road as unacceptable. The safety of non-motorised road users, including pedestrians, should be prioritised and footways provided on access roads and drives.'
Ideally, a shared access road would serve no more than five dwellings whereas this development would have eight dwellings.
- e) The site of the new development is on the boundary with the Green Belt and will be visible from this open land. This will have an adverse effect on the amenity value of the nearby houses and also that of the Green Belt land.
- f) As in our previous comments, there will be a considerable loss of vegetation to build this development.

21/0299/HSE 16 Newberries Avenue

Proposal: - Conversion of loft to habitable room with side and rear dormers and front and side rooflights

Object: -

- a) The proposal includes a disproportionately high roof.
- b) The dormer is very large and larger than the maximum 60% in the guidelines. It would not comply with Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E 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.'
- c) The proposed loft conversion would be out of keeping with neighbouring properties and the street scene. This would not accord with Policy SADM30 of Site Allocations and Development Management Plan: -
'Development which complies with the policies in this Plan will be permitted provided it:



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

(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;'

d) The parking standards may not be met with the increased size of the house.

21/0297/HSE 21 Letchmore Road

Proposal: - Part single, part two storey rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable room and conversion of loft to habitable room with juliette balcony, 2 front and 2 rear dormers

Object: -

a) The application includes the addition of front dormers which do not accord with the guidelines in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. 6, g: -

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

b) The proposed addition of a central front extension would be out of keeping with the rest of the house and the street scene.

c) The second floor balcony will lead to significant overlooking. The drawings show a table and chairs and sun lounger. This therefore means the description of the proposals are incorrect because it mentions Juliet balcony and this is clearly not a Juliet balcony.

Members also expressed concerns about the adequacy of the parking for the increased size of the house.

21/0315/FUL High Cross Garage High Cross Aldenham

Proposal: - Demolition of commercial workshop premises and construction of a new detached 4-bed dwellinghouse with habitable accommodation in the roof space, to include formation of new driveway, front gardens and rear amenity space (revised application from 20/0294/FUL).

Object: -

The proposed new dwelling remains unchanged. The proposals didn't seem to address the points raised in the inspector's refusal of the consent in particular points 6,8,10 & 14: -

'6. The proposed dwelling would contrast with the main characteristics of the dwellings that surround it. Including the car port, it would have a 'H' shaped footprint; the first floor would overhang the ground floor at the rear and the eaves heights at the front and rear would vary. These features combined result in an irregular, fussy building form, compared to the simple form of surrounding properties. There would be no consistency between the sizes, or shapes, of the window openings on the front, side and rear



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

elevations of the property; and the range of windows and glazed doors on the rear elevation would dominate the elevation.'

'8. The proposed dwelling would be sited to the rear of properties located along High cross and Kemprow. Although views of the proposal from these roads would be limited, the building would be visible to a degree. It would also be visible from several of the surrounding properties, quite a proportion of properties in the context of the limited number that exist along High Cross and Kemprow. In this context, and for the reasons outlined above, I consider that the design and form of the proposed dwelling would be out of keeping with the designs and simple forms of surrounding properties.'

'10. Notwithstanding my conclusions regarding scale and mass, due to the harm I have found in respect of design and form, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal does not accord with policies SP1 and CS22 of the Hertsmere Local Plan, Development Plan Document: Core Strategy-2013 (CS), SADM11 and SADM30 of the Hertsmere Local Plan, Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan-2016 (DMPP), or paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Collectively, and among other things, these Appeal Decision APP/N1920/W/20/3254519

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate> 3 policies require new development to be of high-quality design, appropriate in appearance to local context and sympathetic to local character, to ensure the creation of attractive places. As there is no dispute between the parties regarding Green Belt issues, I consider Policy SAD26 is not relevant to the determination of the appeal.'

'14. The appellant also contends that the proposal would result in a visual improvement to the site. I agree that the proposed building would be an improvement on the old, utilitarian buildings that currently exist. However, as I have found that the design and form of the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, I consider this is not an aspect that weighs in favour of the proposal.'

21/0328/HSE Primrose Cottage Common Lane Letchmore Heath

Proposal: - Replacement of window sashes only to all elevations (Amended application)

No objection.

20/2052/HSE 25 Aldenham Avenue

Proposal: - Alterations to dwelling comprising of porch extension, driveway, single and two storey rear extension and loft conversion (retrospective application) AMENDED PLANS & DESCRIPTION



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Object: -

- a) The balustrade is out of keeping with the street scene.
- b) The crown roof 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.'
- c) The glass in the porch is of a poor design.
- d) The roof dormer is out of keeping with the street scene and has not been built according to the consent given.
- e) The air conditioning unit on the side of the building at bedroom level is likely to be a noise nuisance.
- f) The boundary spacing on the first floor is less than one metre. Policy HD5, para e, of the Radlett Design Code from the emerging Radlett Neighbourhood Plan states: -
'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'.

For the reasons given above the application does not comply with 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;'

Members agreed that the verdant nature of the frontage should be reinstated and cars should be prevented from driving over the grass verge.

The following consultation from Herts County Council is in respect of Application reference number: PL/0194/21

Application for the variation of condition 15 (Approved Plans and Documents) of planning permission 0/1082-18 to achieve consistency with the site layout at Works Field, Blackbirds Farm, Blackbirds Lane, Aldenham, High Cross, WD25

No comment.