



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **Planning Committee** meeting held on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2021 at 2.30pm using video conferencing using ['Zoom' meeting website](#) -- meeting ID: 868 0822 5912

Present: Cllrs M Cherry (Chairman), E Samuelson, J Lefton and A Rubinson.

Officer: P Evans (Parish Council Manager) Minutes written P Paley (Planning Officer)

There were also 4 members of the public.

### **387. Apologies for absence**

Apologies was received from Cllr S Khawaja and G Taylor (co-opted member).

### **388. 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 21/0624/HSE, 53 Cobden Hill, as the site backs on to Aldenham Parish Council land.

### **389. To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2021.**

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

### **390. 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 about planning application number 21/0729/FUL, 8 Aldenham Grove.

One member of the public spoke about planning application number 21/0622/FUL, 7 Mornington Road.

Two members of the public chose to observe.

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

### **391. For information: Planning Applications of the following type: - Certificate of Lawful Development (Existing) CLE, Certificate of**



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

### Lawful Development (Proposed) CLP and Listed Building Consent LBC.

#### **21/0671/PD42 18 Craigweil Avenue**

**Proposal:** - Single storey rear extension. Depth - 6m, Height - 3m, Eaves - 2.75m

#### **21/0726/PD42 31A New Road**

**Proposal:** - Single storey rear extension Depth: 6m Height: 3.6m Eaves: 2.72m.

These were noted.

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

21/0189/FUL Bhaktivedanta Manor, Dharam Marg, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham (APC – No objection)

20/1998/HSE 1 Wall Hall Lodge, Wall Hall Drive, Aldenham (APC – No objection)

20/2054/FUL 20 Aldenham Ave (APC – Objection)

The following application was refused by Hertsmere Borough Council: -  
21/0315/FUL High Cross Garage, High Cross, Aldenham (APC – Objected)

### **393. Date of next meeting**

The next Planning Committee meeting will commence at 2.30pm on Monday 3rd May 2021.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 3.30pm.

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

### **394. Planning Applications**

#### **21/0622/FUL 7 Mornington Road**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of new detached 2 storey, 6-bed dwelling to include lower ground level and accommodation in the roof space with associated parking, bin store and landscaping.

**Object:** -

**a) The proposed new dwelling would not comply with policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan in terms of scale and mass: -**

**'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;**



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

- b) The distance to the boundary, shared with number 9 Mornington Road, would be insufficient to satisfy current guidelines.
- c) The proposal would result in loss of light to a principal room of the neighbour at number 5 Mornington road and it would also result in a loss of privacy to the neighbour at number 9 Mornington Road as the first floor windows to the rear, would give rise to overlooking. For these reasons, the application would not comply with policy **SADM30** of the Hertsmere Borough Council - **Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan - Adopted 2016:** -

*'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:*

*(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.'*

### **21/0623/HSE 10 Meadow Mead**

**Proposal:** - Construction of single storey front, side and rear extension and alterations to fenestration.

**No objection.**

### **21/0624/HSE 53 Cobden Hill**

**Proposal:** - Two storey rear extension

**No objection.**

### **21/0647/HSE 28 The Grove**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing front porch and construction of single storey front extension to include front roof light and alterations to fenestration.

**No objection.**

### **21/0631/FUL Adelaide Lodge High Cross Aldenham**

**Proposal:** - Construction of a detached 2 storey, 3 bed dwelling adjacent to Adelaide Lodge

**Object:** -

- a) This site is in the Green Belt but no special circumstances have been demonstrated for this building on the Green Belt. The advice from the National Planning Policy Framework is that, *'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.'* (NPPF para 143)

Furthermore,



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

***'A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt.'* (NPPF para 145)**

- b) The proposed new dwelling would be squeezed into a small plot next to Adelaide Lodge. As a result, the boundary spacing would be inadequate at first floor and ground floor level and 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 footprint of the new house would be bigger than the adjacent house, Adelaide Lodge. This would be in breach of 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, urban form;'***
- d) There would only be one space for car parking for the new property. This would be inadequate for a 3 bed dwelling.
- e) Members noted that this site on a busy main road and consideration should be given to highway safety.

**Members noted that permission has already been given for a large extension at Adelaide Lodge.**

### **21/0652/FUL 1 & 2 Sidney Cottages Aldenham Road Elstree**

**Proposal:** - Construction of single storey side and 2 storey rear extensions to No's 1 & 2 Sidney Cottages (revised application to 21/0139/HSE & 21/0140/HSE)

**No objection.**

### **21/0687/HSE 43 The Crosspath**

**Proposal:** - Part single, part two storey rear extension and alterations to roof to include new roof structure with increase in height, insertion of 3 rooflights. Associated fenestration changes

**Object:** -

**The boundary spacing of the extended house would be inadequate at ground and first 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'.***

### **21/0697/HSE 47 Battlers Green Drive**



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

**Proposal:** - Single storey and part first floor rear and side extension, porch to front and outbuilding to rear.

**Object:** -

- a) **The extended house would right up to the boundary which could lead to future terracing. It 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 outbuilding is very large and it was noted that no details have been supplied in respect of the internal layout and the purpose of the outbuilding. It would also be in breach of policy HD5 para e, of the Radlett Design Code from the emerging Radlett Neighbourhood Plan as it would be less than one metre to the boundary at ground floor.**  
*'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 requested that, if the officer is minded to approve the application, a condition is included that the outbuilding can only be used in conjunction with the main house and not used for any commercial activities.**

### **21/0739/HSE 21 Folly Close**

**Proposal:** - Conversion of garage to habitable room.

**Members had no objections providing there would be sufficient parking for the property.**

### **21/0729/FUL 8 Aldenham Grove**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing house and garage and construction of a replacement 2 storey, detached 6 bed dwelling to include separate self-contained guest accommodation above the double garage, and basement level with swimming pool, erection of detached outbuilding and associated landscaping.

**Object:** -

- a) **The proposed new dwelling would be out of keeping with the area. It would not therefore comply with policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Borough Council - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan - Adopted 2016:** -  
*'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;*



## ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

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

*(iii) results in a high quality design.'*

In terms of local character, it would not comply with policy HD3 of The Radlett Neighbourhood Plan: -

*'Development proposals are required to reflect and respond positively to local townscape and landscape character'.*

b) The proposed garage part of the development would be right on the rear boundary. 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'.*

### **21/0737/HSE 3 Cary Walk**

**Proposal:** - Part single, part two storey side and rear extension, conversion of loft to habitable room including rear and side dormers. Fenestration changes.

**Members had no objections to the application providing the side dormers have obscured glass as per the planning application.**

### **21/0675/FUL Hill Farm Watling Street**

**Proposal:** - Demolition of existing life expired light industrial unit and erection of replacement with new on similar footprint.

**No comment.**

### **21/0625/FUL Unit 7 Battlers Green Farm Common Lane**

**Proposal:** - Change of use from agricultural space (used for storage of materials and tools) to a Hand Car Wash and Valeting Centre, which includes the erection of a canopy, wet wash area & using of the existing cabin area.

**Members considered this application but decided not to comment.**