

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 21st December 2020 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using <u>'Zoom' meeting website</u> -- meeting ID:828 7157 2984.

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 three members of the public.

319. Apologies for absence

All Councillors were present.

320. 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. Cllr M Cherry declared a pecuniary interest in planning application number 20/1980/FUL The Three Horseshoes The Green, Letchmore Heath, as he has an interest in the property.
- b) Members must also declare any other pecuniary or nonpecuniary 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 backs on to Aldenham Parish Land.

321. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 7th December 2020

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

322. 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 20/1971/FUL Elstree Aerodrome Hogg Lane Elstree.

One member of the public spoke regarding planning application number 20/2010/FUL Barn On Land Surrounding Kemprow Farm, Kemprow, Aldenham.

One member of the public chose to observe.

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



323. 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.

20/1956/CLP Elstree Aerodrome Hogg Lane Elstree

Proposal: - Construction of new operational hangar building and ancillary office spaces to include security fencing with pedestrian access and associated parking. Certificate of Lawful Development (Proposed).

20/1981/LBC The Three Horseshoes The Green Letchmore Heath Proposal: - Demolition of existing rear extension and outbuildings and construction of a single storey rear extension to include an outdoor BBQ area, and incorporation of timber outbuilding into main building. External repair works and internal alterations throughout (Application for Listed Building Consent).

20/2000/CLE Glebe House Church Lane Aldenham

Proposal: - Replacement of single glazed windows with slim profile double glazed units in bay windows. Certificate of Lawful Development (Existing).

20/2011/LBC Barn On Land Surrounding Kemprow Farm, Kemprow, Aldenham

Proposal: - Restoration and conversion of Grade II listed barn and creation of landscaped courtyard. Erection of single storey barn extension on footprint of existing barn with glazed link, basement and sunken terrace. Erection of new open sided car port and ground store. Demolition of buildings and structures and associated landscaping. (Revised Application for Listed Building consent).

20/2046/PD56S Unit 21D, Unit 20B Unit 20C Battlers Green Farm Common Lane

Proposal: - Change of use from Class E office to Class F.1 learning centre (Unit 21D) and Class E physiotherapy centre (Unit 20B & Unit 20C).

These were noted.

324. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

The following applications were approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: -

20/1710/HSE 14 Mornington Road (APC – No objection)

20/1641/HSE 19 The Heath (APC - No objection)

20/1549/VOC 126A Watling St (APC – No objection)

20/1595/HSE Phillimore House, Watling Street, Elstree (APC – No objection)

20/0245/FUL 10 and 10A Watford (APC - Objected)

20/1598/HSE 8 Radlett Park Road (APC - Objected)



20/1357/HSE 8 Park Road (APC – Objected) 20/1576/HSE 2 Links Drive (APC – Objected)

The following applications were refused by Hertsmere Borough Council: -20/1643/FUL 4 Hilfield Lane, Aldenham (APC – No comments made as not in Parish)

20/1566/FUL Land North Of Battlers Green Farm, Common Lane (APC – Objected)

The following applications have gone to appeal: - 20/1295/FUL 14 Links Drive (APC – Objected) 19/1162/FUL Spylaw House, Newlands Ave (APC – Objected)

325. Date of next meeting

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday 4th January 2021

326. Planning Applications

There being no further bus	siness the meeting closed at 4.35 pm.
Chairman	Date

Planning applications discussed at meeting on 21st December 2020

20/1949/HSE 6 Folly Pathway

Proposal: - Single storey rear extension. Demolition of carport and construction of garage. Changes to fenestration and application of render to all elevations

No objection.

20/1967/VOC 121 Newberries Ave

Proposal: - Application for variation of a condition 2 (plans) to allow for an increase in depth to rear extension at ground and first floor level following grant of planning permission 20/1375/HSE

Object: -

Planning permission has already been given for a substantial increase in the size of this house and members had objected to the proposals in that application. The proposal in this application is to increase the size of the house even more. Members object to this further increase in size and agreed that similar reasons for objecting previously still stand: -

a) The extended property would breach the two metre (to the boundary) rule on one side. This would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E para. Section 4, j and 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'

- b) Members would question whether there would be adequate parking spaces for a five bedroomed property.
- c) The Juliette balcony in the rear roof face may give rise to overlooking.

20/1975/VOC 10 Aldenham Avenue

Proposal: - Application for variation of condition 2 (plans) to allow for amendments to 3 houses to include alterations to layout, chimney, infilled porch, fenestration changes and an increase in footprint following grant of planning permission 20/1173/FUL.

Object: -

The changes proposed in this application are quite substantial. It includes an increase in the footprint and scale of each house. On this site, it would result in an overly dense development: -

- a) There would be a considerable increase in the size of dwellings 2 and 3 as follows 1= increase of 2.5%, 2= increase of 110%, 3= increase of 89%.
- b) The average plot coverage of 15 surrounding houses is16.6%. The proposed densities on this site would be 30%, i.e. nearly double the density of neighbouring houses. This may not comply with the policy CS1 of the Core Strategy where, in the case of new development, the Council takes account of the character, pattern and density of the surrounding area.
- c) Increasing the size of each plot will inevitably mean the reduction of the natural landscape at this site. This would not comply with policy CS12 of the Core Strategy: 'All development proposals <u>must</u> conserve and enhance the natural environment of the Borough, including biodiversity, habitats, protected trees, landscape character,'
- d) The residents of the new houses would have no right to parking on the road and have limited space for parking on these tight plots.
- e) As dwelling 3 is 3 metres higher than dwelling 1, the 3 metre spacing seems rather scant.

20/1980/FUL The Three Horseshoes The Green Letchmore Heath Proposal: - Demolition of existing rear extension and outbuildings and construction of a single storey rear extension to include an outdoor BBQ area, and incorporation of timber outbuilding into main building. External repair works and internal alterations throughout. (Archaeological building record received 08.12.20).



This application was discussed at the end of the meeting. Cllr M Cherry left the meeting before the discussion commenced at 4.23pm.

20/1659/FUL Flat 2, 8 Hawtrees

Proposal: - Erection of single storey garage in existing garden for top floor flat. (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 27/11/2020)

No objection.

20/1971/FUL Elstree Aerodrome Hogg Lane Elstree

Proposal: - Construction of a new access from Aldenham Road, north of junction with Butterfly Lane, onto Elstree Aerodrome, to the north of the runway.

Object: -

Without any proper supporting evidence of a need for this new access, members cannot support this application.

No evidence for special circumstances has been provided for this access road in the Green Belt. Also, no proper plan has been included to show the route of the road.

20/1998/HSE 1 Wall Hall Lodge Wall Hall Drive Aldenham

Proposal: - Part single/part two storey side extension with new dormer window and roof extension to rear elevation at first floor level. Changes to fenestration, removal of chimney, and new gates to front boundary. **No objection.**

20/1992/HSE 10 Canter Close, Aldenham

Proposal: - Erection of first floor balcony with glass ballustarde to side elevation

Members did not comment on this application as it is not in Aldenham Parish.

20/2018/HSE Roundbush House Round Bush Lane Aldenham

Proposal: - Demolition of existing two storey rear extension. Alterations to fenestration at rear elevation and relocation of front porch.

Members had no objections to this application but note that there would be a change in the roof ridge height.

20/2010/FUL Barn On Land Surrounding Kemprow Farm, Kemprow, Aldenham,

Proposal: - Restoration and conversion to residential use of Grade II listed barn and creation of landscaped courtyard. Erection of single storey barn extension on footprint of existing barn with glazed link, basement and sunken terrace. Erection of new open sided car port and ground store. Demolition of buildings and structures and associated landscaping. **Object:** -



Members would welcome the sympathetic restoration of all the listed buildings not just one but the demolition of the square northerly building appears to be in order to accommodate the building of the very large basement.

Members agreed that this application has not substantially changed since the last application which was withdrawn. Members previous objections still apply to this application.

- a) The siting of this proposed dwelling appears to be on Green Belt land but no exceptional circumstances have been put forward to build on this land. It would also be close to the road and visible from the Green Belt and from the footpaths.
- b) This would be a very substantial building and members believe that it would lead to the loss of trees which cannot be justified.
- c) Members understand that this is agricultural land and to allow a residential conversion to the barn would significantly change its use for the future. Also, the boundary marked for the residential site is the same as the boundary for the agricultural land and, if this planning application is given permission, we would strongly recommend a curtailment of further development rights on this land which equates to roughly 1.4 hectares.
- d) The connecting passageway between the two structures, which is glass, would significantly stand out as a modern feature and would not be in keeping with a Grade two character site.

The applicant has not demonstrated any justification towards the change of use from an agricultural building to a dwelling nor its discontinued viable use as such.

The proposed works, in this environment, must demonstrate that the public benefit outweighs harm. There is no evidence to support that this development would be of substantial public benefit. Whilst the barn is in need of preservation, the proposed scheme of work, as a whole, fails to preserve the special interest of the listed building. Members agreed that the level of harm caused by such a scheme could not be justified against this setting of designated heritage assets and the Green Belt.

20/2012/HSE 5 Station Road

Proposal: - Single storey and first floor rear extensions

Members do not object, in principle, to the first floor extension. However, members were concerned that the ground floor extension may breach the 45-degree angle and would be less than one metre (to the boundary). This may have a detrimental effect on the light and amenity space presently enjoyed in the living room of the neighbouring house.



20/2013/HSE 5 Station Road

Proposal: - Conversion of loft to habitable room with rear dormer.

Object: -

The proposed loft conversion is not typical in the Radlett North Conservation area so would not comply with Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan: -

'Development which complies with the policies in this Plan will be permitted provided it:

ii) recognises and complements the particular local character of the area in which it is located,'

Also, it exceeds 60% of the roof space which would not accord with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E 2006, section 6, f: 'As a general rule, the Council will resist dormers that take up more than 60% of the roof face.'

20/2014/FUL 63 Goodyers Avenue

Proposal: - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a detached 5-bed dwelling with accommodation in the roof space to include new wrought iron gates and brick piers, formation of new access and crossover, and associated ancillary works.

Object: -

- a) The design of the house is not in keeping with the street scene so would not comply with SADM30 of the Hertsmere Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan: 'Development which complies with the policies in this Plan will be permitted provided it:
- ii) recognises and complements the particular local character of the area in which it is located,'
- b) The proposal breaches the two metre (to the boundary rule) at first floor level. This would not comply with the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E section 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'
- c) The proposal features a crown roof which would be unsympathetic to the surrounding area and would contravene Part D 9.4.2 h of the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide: 'these tend to appear bulky and overbearing'.
- d) The dormer window may give rise to overlooking. The dormer in the front elevation will create an overdominant appearance.
- e) The proposed gates and front fence are not typical of the street scene. Also, the proposed gates would be 1.8 metres high and right on the boundary. This would not be in line with the



Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide E paragraph 7, k which states that: -

'they should be set back from the street, modest in scale,'
The position of the gates could be a concern for Highway safety as
they are not set back

f) This site narrows towards the back of the plot and, whilst the spacing at the front may seem adequate, it would have a bulky and overbearing appearance at this location as it is adjacent to two bungalows.

20/1834/FUL 41 Watford Road

Proposal: - Installation of electric entrance gates and fencing to front

boundary
Object: -

The proposal features gates which are 1.8 metres high and there are no plans to include vegetation to soften the hard landscaping. This would not be in keeping with the street scene and thus would not be in line with the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan Design code c and h. Where gates require planning permission, they should: -

'respect local character and do not dominate their surroundings.' Also, that boundary treatments should: -

'reflect the prevailing character of boundaries, with special attention to retaining open character and green hedges, and avoiding boundaries that appear unduly dominant.'

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

Proposal: - Alterations to No 15 Cobden Hill; erection of 8 x 3 bed dwellings with garages and parking spaces; new vehicular and pedestrian access drive; landscaping and ancillary works.

Object: -

Whilst members acknowledge that amendments have been made to improve some aspects of the application, there were still reasons to object to the application.

Members agreed that the previous comments still apply to this amended application.

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 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.

As Cllr M Cherry had declared a pecuniary interest in the following application number 20/1980/FUL, he left the meeting, at 4.23pm, before the discussion of the application. Cllr E Samuelson took over as Chair of the meeting at this point.

20/1980/FUL The Three Horseshoes The Green Letchmore Heath

Proposal: - Demolition of existing rear extension and outbuildings and construction of a single storey rear extension to include an outdoor BBQ area, and incorporation of timber outbuilding into main building. External repair works and internal alterations throughout. (Archaeological building record received 08.12.20).

Members had no objections subject to the approval of the Heritage Officer in this Conservation Area. Members added that they welcome the retention of the pub.