



Minutes Planning Committee

Date 10/10/2022
Time 19:30 - 21:30
Location Douglas Hicks Meeting Room
Chair Cllr M Cherry
Attendees Cllrs E Samuelson, S Khawaja & G Taylor (Co-opted Member)
Officer S Heighton (Admin – OS)

Also present was 11 members of the public & 1 Borough Councillor

1 Apologies for absence.

Minutes:

Apologies were received from Cllr A Robinson.

2 Declarations of interest on any item on the Agenda.

Minutes:

None

3 To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 28th September 2022

Minutes:

The minutes of the meeting on 28th September 2022 were confirmed and signed by Cllr M Cherry as a true record of that meeting.

4 To adjourn the meeting for members of the public to address the Committee (if any) in accordance with Standing Order 1 d.

Minutes:

Cllr M Cherry suspended standing orders so that the members of the public could address the committee. The members of the public raised concerns regarding agenda item 6.a, 22/1539/OUT - Land South of Shenley Hill. Members asked questions for clarification, before the members of public were thanked for their attendance and standing orders were then resumed. Cllr M Cherry suggested that this application was considered next which was agreed.

5 To discuss the following consultations

Minutes:

These were noted.

- 5.a** Hertsmere Borough Council's Statement of Licensing Policy 2023 – 2028 is now out for consultation. To view the draft Statement of Licensing Policy, please follow the below link: <https://www.hertsmere.gov.uk/Business/Licensing/Alcohol-Entertainment-Licensing/Hertsmere-Borough-Council's-Statement-of-Licensing-Policy-2023---2028.aspx> As the local Parish and Town Councils if you would like to make any comments or provide any feedback, the end date the consultee comments is 10th November 2022.
- 5.b** Views on the future of South West Hertfordshire are being invited, as a draft vision for the area which aspires to accelerate 'positive change' is now open for public consultation. The South West Hertfordshire 2050 – Realising Our Potential document, includes a draft vision and objectives for the area until 2050 and marks the first formal plan-making stage for the South West Herts Joint Strategic Plan (JSP), which is being drawn up by Hertsmere Borough Council, St Albans City and District Council, Dacorum Borough Council, Three Rivers District Council and Watford Borough Council, supported by Hertfordshire County Council. SW Herts is one of only a small number of councils in the UK working together in this way. By considering the longer-term future of a bigger area as whole, the opportunities for the future such as more Government funding for infrastructure improvements are greater. The full document is available to view at www.swhertsplan.com/consultation. Responses can be submitted until 5pm on Friday 4 November.

6 Planning Applications

- 6.a** 22/1539/OUT - Land South of Shenley Hill Radlett – Proposal: Erection of up to 195 new homes (40% affordable), safeguarded land for the expansion of Newberries Primary School and provision of a new medical centre, along with associated access, landscaping and parking. Outline application to include the matter of ACCESS (with the following matters reserved: APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT and SCALE).

Minutes:

Object

- a) The proposals would be contrary to Green Belt legislation, NPPF2021, which applies to the whole site, which comprises agricultural land with no previous development [The site was

previously protected by Hertsmere as a Landscape Protected Area, in Local Plan 2003]. In the Hertsmere Local Plan 2012-2027, the site is protected by Policy SADM10, Biodiversity and Habitats and a Regionally Important Geological site [RIGS] – a source of rare Hertfordshire Puddingstone; the southern part of the site is protected as a Local Nature Reserve and is where bluebells are found. The site is a very successful feeding and breeding area for over 40 species of birds, as well as small mammals, butterflies, deer and foxes.

b) No Very Special Circumstances exist or have been shown to justify release from the Metropolitan Green Belt. The land is agricultural land Grade 3b. The proposals would undermine the site's contribution to the countryside character of Watling Chase Community Forest. The development's access road on Theobald Street would cut through a listed Wildlife Site and bluebell wood, which lies alongside Theobald Street. This would be highly detrimental to the movement of land animals, deer, badgers, foxes etc. Road access from Radlett to the site would be lengthy as, other than a new footpath linking to Williams Way, both routes are a long way round for vehicles, both via Shenley Hill and via Theobald Street and that on Shenley Hill is particularly dangerous.

c) The site is not an infill, but an outward extension to the urban area of Radlett, reducing the vital area of open countryside space between the settlements of Radlett, Borehamwood and Shenley.

d) There would no direct integration of the site into Radlett.

e) The Radlett Neighbourhood Plan Character Assessment states that, for the whole of Radlett, in 2016, the average number of dwellings per hectare was 11. By building upwards, by being more closely spaced and with reduced parking and amenity spaces, this development differs from Radlett by accommodating around 36 dwellings per hectare.

f) The Radlett Neighbourhood Plan states that one of its visions and objectives (3.1), is 'to promote the protection and positive use of the Green Belt by providing more opportunity to access it by foot, horseback and bicycle. The RNP vision was to 'Protect and enhance the leafy and biodiverse nature of Radlett's streets, neighbourhoods and open countryside.'

g) Such a significant increase in Radlett's housing, the largest for 50 years, will no doubt give rise to further pressures on local infrastructure, and this point was made in our objections to the draft Local Plan. Highways are already hugely congested particularly at peak times leading into and out of Radlett. This would increase significantly with the scheme providing for the levels of car parking required in the design guide.

Other infrastructure that would need improving to accommodate this

volume of new housing would be: 1. Schooling, (increasing need for a suitable secondary school as secondary schools at present are only found in Bushey, Borehamwood and Watford. The plans do not show an extension to the buildings at Newberries Primary School only additional playing fields. Increased spaces for pupils will no doubt be required by the provision of so much family housing); 2. A larger doctors surgery in Radlett (the application refers to Medical centre but doesn't say what type or whether a provider wants and has funding for this location see below) 3. Increased car parking provision in Radlett, both for shops and station, 4. New cycle routes (although cycling from Radlett to this site is exceptionally difficult for many due to the steep nature of Shenley Hill), 5. Improved pedestrian routes and pedestrian safety, particularly over the narrow railway bridges leading into Radlett.

h) There is no direct, dedicated upgraded access for pedestrians and cyclists to Radlett Station proposed.

i) Opportunities for local employment for new residents would be few; Hertsmere's main employment areas are Borehamwood, Bushey & Potters Bar.

j) While land is shown to be set-aside for a Medical Centre, there is no guarantee that it will materialise, let alone have funding. In any event, the proposed location is outside main area of local population to be served. With all the additional road trips that would be generated, the location would be considered unsustainable.

As the provision of a Medical Centre is not guaranteed and as per the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan RV2, it states that 'The retention or enhancement of the range of medical services in Radlett will be supported. Any such use should be located in the Village Centre unless it can be stated there are no viable and deliverable sites.'

k) The type of affordable housing is not indicated. We are all aware that in an expensive area such as Radlett the type of affordable housing proposed is key, as the housing costs for incoming families may be unaffordable.

l) Poor solar orientation. This negative aspect is particularly evident in autumn/winter mornings as the early sun casts a long shadow across the site until well after 0900. For the site to be sustainable, it is at these times of year, when air and ground temperatures are low that this solar benefit would be absent. Compounding these negative effects is the steeply rising wooded land east of the site, which has a protected mixed border of selected trees. To the east, the land rises to 126 metres at Wood Hall, about 1km distant. This hill prevents sunlight from reaching the ground until late morning in some parts of the site, which would make this location for dwellings particularly damp, shady and therefore unsustainable and unsuitable.

m) The public consultation was disingenuous and inadequate. It was held virtually without a public meeting/exhibition and during the peak holiday season (5th - 31st August 2022) when many people would have been on holiday. Over half of the Radlett population were excluded from the consultation process as the statement of public consultation shows that the letters sent out did not go to those on the south side of Radlett in the area from Watling Street covering Watford Road, Loom Lane, Battlers Farm, Newlands Avenue etc. All of the boundaries in Radlett which are included in the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan should have been consulted.

n) We would like to be notified as to when the Committee hearing will take place.

**6.b 22/1579/HSE - 4 The Sycamores Radlett – Proposal:
Retention of raised decking and balustrade.**

Minutes:

No Objection

**6.c 22/1107/VOC - 121 Newberries Avenue, Radlett – Proposal:
Application for variation of condition 2 (plans) to allow for
design alterations to rear patio following grant of planning
permissions 20/1375/HSE and 20/1967/VOC. (Amended
Plans received 22/09/2022 - Increase in boundary fence
height and alteration to front garden landscaping.)**

Minutes:

Object

a) The patio has been built in contravention to the original planning consent. It is too high, which causes severe overlooking with the neighbours property. This has caused the neighbours to erect higher fencing, in order to keep their privacy.

b) If the officer is minded to approve the application, sufficient landscaping should be put in at the applicants expense to prevent overlooking.

c) APC ask that suitable vegetation is considered in order to keep the verdant nature of the road as stated in the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan.

**6.d 22/0777/HSE - The Cottage, 9A The Avenue, Radlett –
Proposal: Part conversion of garage to habitable room, first
floor side to include new dormer, and single storey front infill
extension with associated roof alterations (Amended
description 27/06/2022, Amended plans received on
31/08/2022, Daylight/sunlight report received 27/09/2022).**

Minutes:

No Objection

- 6.e 22/1610/HSE - 22 Cobden Hill Radlett – Proposal: Demolition of existing detached garage, construction of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, and alterations to fenestration. Internal re-configuration to existing annexe, with new mezzanine floor and insertion of dormer windows to create additional habitable accommodation.**

Minutes:

No Objection

- 6.f 22/1601/FUL - 6 Hawtrees Radlett – Proposal: Demolition of existing detached dwelling and erection of replacement two storey, detached, 5 bed dwelling to include basement level and habitable loft accommodation with 2 x rear dormer windows and roof lights to front and side elevations. Construction of a single storey, detached, double garage to front elevation and associated landscaping to include boundary treatment, amenity space, parking, bin store and cycle store.**

Minutes:

Object

- a) The planning application does not appear to have a roof drawing, which we assume is a crown roof contrary to SADM 30, Design Guide D.
- b) The depth of the side walls is considerably longer than existing, which we would consider to be contrary to the Design Principles of SADM30, in terms of scale, mass and bulk.
- c) There are two cars parked which appear to be in some form of structure, not included in the plans. We assume this would entail the removal of trees as it does not exist in the drawings.

- 6.g 21/1678/FUL - 58 Watford Road, Radlett – Proposal: Demolition of existing house, lowering of site levels and construction of two pairs of 3-bedroom semi-detached dwellings.**

Minutes:

No Objection

- 7 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.**

Minutes:

This was noted.

- 7.a 22/1626/PD42 - 30 Beech Avenue Radlett – Proposal: Single storey rear extension. Depth: 8m, Height: 2.86m, Eaves: 2.86m.**

8 Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

Minutes:

These were noted.

- 8.a 22/1257/HSE - 40 Newlands Avenue, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objections to the main house proposals. However, it does Object to the pool house and patio proposals**

- 8.b 22/0011/VOC - 10 Aldenham Avenue, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was Object**

- 8.c 21/2223/FUL - 1 - 3 Newlands Avenue, Radlett – HBC decision was Refuse Permission – APC comment was Object**

- 8.d 22/1348/HSE - 5 Beech Avenue, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was Object**

9 Date of next meeting 24th October 2022

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.15pm.

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