



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Monday 15th March 2021 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using ['Zoom' meeting website](#) -- meeting ID:8287 1572 984

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

Officer: P Paley (Planning Officer)

There were also 3 members of the public.

### **369. Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from Cllrs. E Samuelson and S Khawaja.

### **370. 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.**

Cllr J Lefton declared a non pecuniary interest in planning application number, 21/0358/FUL, Fir Spring Cottage, The Pathway, as the applicant is a friend.

### **371. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2021.**

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

### **372. 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 21/0358/FUL, Fir Spring Cottage, The Pathway.

Two members of the public chose to observe.

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

### **373. To discuss the following (deferred from last meeting): -**

**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](#)**



## **ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

**Members agreed that the core structure is good however, it is unclear what the plan is for the reduction of waste. There are many points within the policies that leave things too open for interpretation. There is a need for more rigorous regulations and guidelines in some areas. Greater ambition is needed in view of the UK's Climate Change targets.**

### **The Hertfordshire Vision**

**“In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, the county council will engage with relevant authorities, including London, to monitor waste movements....”**

**As well as monitoring should it be minimising as well.**

**“There will be a flexible and supportive plan-based approach towards waste management facilities”. Flexible leaves the plan based approach open to all sorts of interpretation, this needs stricter rules/guidelines in order to not lead to interpretation.**

### **Strategic Policy 1: Waste Management Facilities in Hertfordshire**

**“In order to achieve net self- sufficiency”, rural locations may be acceptable in principle for waste facilities.**

**What will have the higher priority, housing or waste site development?**

### **Strategic Policy 2: Safeguarding Waste Management Facilities**

**“To ensure the continued delivery of a network of waste management facilities” There is only a mention of continued delivery of facilities not a reduction. There is only a finite amount of space. What are the alternatives?**

### **Strategic Policy 3: Climate Change**

**“submit details and reasoning of any measures..... Measures will vary depending on the particular circumstances”**

**Stricter guidelines need to be in place regarding climate change so it is not open for interpretation. This is a potential loophole.**



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

### Strategic Policy 4: Green Belt

**'very special circumstances' could lead to much of the green belt being used. It should be specified what green belt can definitely not be used so not leading to any wrong assumptions.**

### Strategic Policy 5: Cumulative Effects

**All the relevant information should be submitted at application stage with nothing left out. This cumulative effect should be assessed by specialists.**

**374. For information: A licence application has been made by Syn Events at Springfield Farm, Old Parkbury Lane. More information is available on the following website: -**

**[St Albans City and District Council website, licence section](#)**

This was noted.

**375. 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.**

**21/0439/CLP Battlers Green Farm House Common Lane**

**Proposal:** - Conversion of agricultural sheds to habitable room (flexible commercial use, offices). Certificate of lawfulness (Proposed)

**21/0464/LBC Patchetts Cottage, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham**

**Proposal:** - Construction of a single storey rear extension to include a paved rear patio. Installation of hedging at front boundary. Internal alterations to include creation of new bedrooms and master bathroom (Application for Listed Building Consent).

These were noted.

### **376. Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council**

The following applications were approved by Hertsmere Borough Council: -  
20/2051/HSE Triangle Cottage, Back Lane, Letchmore Heath (APC - Objected)

20/2014/FUL 63 Goodyers Avenue (APC - Objected)

20/2069/FUL 46 Newberries Avenue (APC - Objected)

20/1956/CLP Elstree Aerodrome, Hogg Lane, Elstree

20/2133/VOC 6 Loom Lane (APC - No comment)

21/0038/HSE 56 Craigweil Avenue (APC - Objected)

20/2111/OUT 72 Newberries Ave (APC - Objected)



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

20/2048/HSE 4 Red Lion Close, Aldenham, Watford (APC – No objection with conditions)

21/0044/HSE Hillside Cottage, Loom Lane (APC – No objection)

20/2165/HSE 6 Kitswell Way (APC – No objection with comment)

21/0055/HSE The Fairways, 4 Faggotts Close (APC – Objected)

### 377. **Date of next meeting**

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on **Tuesday** 6th April 2021.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 3.35pm.

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

### 378. **Planning Applications**

#### **21/0358/FUL Fir Spring Cottage The Pathway**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of detached garage and construction of two storey, detached, 3 bed dwelling adjacent to main house to include habitable loft accommodation with rear facing Juliet balconies to include associated amenity space, car parking, bicycle store, bin store and landscaping.

**Object: -**

**This application is a repeat of a previous application but since then there is further planning policy in place in the form of the Radlett Neighborhood Plan which should be given considerable weight.**

**a) This application proposes to build a new dwelling in the garden of Fir Spring Cottage and this would be in breach of policy HD4 of the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan: -**

**'HD4 DEVELOPMENT OF GARDEN LAND All development must respect Radlett's distinctive green and verdant qualities. The loss of garden land to development that fails to respect the character and prevailing development pattern of the surrounding area will not be supported.'**

**b) The proposed house does not make a positive contribution to the location in The Pathway. This would not comply with policy 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:**

**(i) makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment;**

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



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

**c) The proposal features a crown roof which would not accord with the guidelines set out in the in the Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide D para. 2.k) I: -**

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

**The proposed new dwelling would have a high impact on the trees at the property but it was noted that an arboricultural impact assessment has not been submitted.**

### **21/0361/HSE Phillimore House Watling Street Elstree**

**Proposal:** - Installation of grass mound to rear garden.

**No objection.**

### **21/0398/HSE 20 Newberries Avenue**

**Proposal:** - Part single/part two storey rear extension and changes to fenestration to side elevation.

**Members had no objection but noted that the 45-degree angle rule would be breached but because of the setting of the house, the effect may not be significant.**

### **21/0396/HSE 7 Meadow Mead**

**Proposal:** - Erection of new front porch, hipped roof alterations over existing front dormers, alterations to side and rear fenestration and insertion of glass balustrade to rear elevation.

**Members had no objection to the application but believe that the space for car parking would need to be checked to ascertain whether it meets the current standards for the size of the house.**

### **21/0410/VOC 50 Newlands Avenue**

**Proposal:** - Application for variation of condition 11 (plans) to allow for alterations to brick colour, garage door, dormer design, side and rear render, ridge height, eaves brick corbel detail, fenestration and removal of stone detailing following grant of planning permission 19/0371/FUL.

**Members had no objections to the cosmetic changes but think that the second floor terrace would need to be looked at as this could give rise to overlooking.**

### **21/0434/HSE 16 Loom Lane**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing garage and erection of ancillary annexe building

**Members had no objection providing the proposed annexe will be subservient to the main house and cannot be used or sold off as a separate dwelling. Equally, it cannot be used for commercial purposes.**



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

**Members would also question whether the distance to the boundary of the proposed building would be compliant with the guidelines as it is two storeys and very close to the boundary.**

### **21/0466/HSE Patchetts Cottage, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham**

**Proposal:** - Construction of a single storey rear extension to include a paved rear patio. Installation of hedging at front boundary. Internal alterations to include creation of new bedrooms and master bathroom.

**No comment.**

### **21/0471/HSE 71 Loom Lane**

**Proposal:** - Construction of part single, part two storey rear extension with rear Juliet balcony and alterations to fenestration.

**Object:** -

- a) **The proposed extension will result in a very large house on a tapering plot which would be overbearing to the neighbours. This would not comply with Policy SADM 30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan: -**  
*'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.'*
- b) **The boundary spacing of the extended house would be inadequate as it is less than one metre at ground floor level. 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 Juliet balcony may give rise to overlooking neighbours properties. This would also be a breach of policy SADM 30 (as above in 'a').**
- d) **The proposed extension will breach the 45-degree angle rule. This does not 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.'*

### **21/0462/HSE 26 Links Drive**

**Proposal:** - Conversion of garage to habitable room, construction of two storey rear extension, part single, part two storey side extension, single storey front extension, new front porch and alterations to fenestration. Conversion of loft to habitable room with associated roof alterations to



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

include front and rear dormers and insertion of roof lights to both side and rear elevations.

**Object: -**

- a) **The boundary spacing of the proposed extensions would be inadequate on both ground and first floor levels. The extended house would sit uncomfortably on its plot as it would be too close to the boundary all along its length. The proposed extensions 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'.***
- b) **The application includes the addition of a front dormer which is out of keeping with neighbours properties. This would 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.'***
- c) **The proposals feature 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.'***