



## **DRAFT Minutes Planning Committee**

**Date** 24/10/2022  
**Time** 19:30 - 21:30  
**Location** Douglas Hicks Meeting Room  
**Chair** Cllr M Cherry  
**Attendees** Cllrs E Samuelson, S Khawaja & A Robinson  
**Officer** S Heighton (Admin – OS)

Also present was 15 members of the public

### **1 Apologies for absence.**

*Minutes:*

All members were present

### **2 Declarations of interest on any item on the Agenda.**

#### **2.a Disclosable pecuniary interests they or their spouse/partner have in any matter which is to be considered at this meeting**

*Minutes:*

The Committee declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 5.j, 22/1702/FUL as the application is made from Aldenham Parish Council

#### **2.b Members must also declare any other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests they have in any matter to be considered at this meeting.**

*Minutes:*

None

### **3 To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on 10th October 2022**

*Minutes:*

The minutes of the meeting of 10th October 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 5.d, 22/1669/FUL - Land adjacent to 1 and 3 Thelusson Court. Members asked questions for clarification, before the members of public were thanked for their attendance and standing orders were resumed. Cllr M Cherry suggested that this application was considered next which was agreed.

## **5 Planning Applications**

### **5.a 22/1642/FUL - 11 Medow Mead Radlett – Proposal: Demolition of existing 4-bed detached dwelling and construction of a new 4- bed detached dwelling to include accommodation in the loft space**

*Minutes:*

No Objection

### **5.b 22/1653/HSE - 19 Oakridge Avenue Radlett – Proposal: Construction of a part single, part two storey front extension, two storey side extension with new integral garage and alterations to fenestration. Conversion of loft to habitable space with associated roof alterations to include an increase in ridge height and insertion of 2 x rear dormers and 1 x front dormer. Alterations to front driveway to include additional vehicle crossover and new entrance gates.**

*Minutes:*

Object

- a) The plans do not show the front gates and proposed boundary treatment
- b) The 2 - storey side extension is less than 2 metres from the boundary, so would not be compliant with Design Guide E
- c) The proposed front extension is coming forward from the existing building line which breaches the 45° angle from the nearest front window of 21 Oakridge Avenue. It is in breach of Design Guide E KP-4 'Dormer windows should be as small as possible, providing light from the room rather than enabling a large amount of floorspace in the roof to be used. In most cases the dormer, should not take no more than 60% of the roof slope. Dormers should be located within the rear roof slope.'

### **5.c 22/1649/HSE - 5 Radlett Park Road Radlett – Proposal: Part single/part two storey rear extension.**

*Minutes:*

Object

- a) The new construction is extended by 3.9m which is on the boundary with 7 Radlett Park Road, so would be in breach of Design Guide E
- b) The drawings do not show the impact the rear windows will have on 7 Radlett Park Road in terms of the 45° line and of light and amenity space
- c) There must be a loss of trees, but there is no arboricultural report shown on the proposal.

**5.d 22/1669/FUL - Land Adjacent To 1 And 3 Thelusson Court Woodfield Road Radlett – Proposal: Construction of 4 x 3-bed residential dwellings with habitable loft accommodation to include associated parking, amenity, landscaping and cycle store.**

*Minutes:*

Object

- a) The proposal is in contrary of various policies in the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan;
  - (i) HD3 'Respecting and enhancing the local townscape and landscape character and patterns - Development proposals are required to reflect and respond positively to local townscape and landscape character. Development within the settlement of Radlett should have regard to the Radlett Character Assessment and the Radlett Design Code. All development must respect local character and residential amenity'
  - (ii) 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'
  - (iii) HD5 'Healthy high quality trees and hedges - Development proposals should retain healthy high quality trees, woodland and hedges in the Neighbourhood Area'
- b) The proposed scheme does not comply with of SADM 30 which states - '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, privacy, light, nuisance and pollution. In this case there is a loss of amenity space for the flat and house owners
- c) We believe the proposal of the height of the car park is too high in relation to the flats, but the detail is not clear

- d) The existing garages shown are not fit or usable for modern cars and the spaces are too small. The existing car park needs some configuration
- e) There is a discrepancy in the Ecological reports as the gardens of the properties are shown the other way round and the gardens would be heavily shaded
- f) The dwellings will have poor solar orientation because of the topography and the existing mature tree plantation to the west of the site
- g) Scrubbits Wood which adjoins this scheme is a designated wildlife site which is in breach of in breach of SADM10
- h) The proposal is also in breach of SADM 11 and SADM 12:
  - (i) Landscape Character 'Development will be manages to help conserve enhance and/or restore the character of the wider landscape across the borough
  - (ii) Trees, Landscaping and Development - 'Planning permission will be refused for development which would result in the loss, or likely loss, of: healthy, high quality trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order; or any healthy, high quality trees and/or hedgerows that make a valuable contribution to the amenity or environment of the area in which they are located'
- i) The site is not surplus land as stated by the applicant, as the residents maintain the gardens and have a 999 year lease. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also makes it very clear that land in built up areas such as private residential gardens should not be built upon and there is no presumption in favour of development on garden land
- j) The dormer windows in the front roof slopes, which would cause overlooking and be in breach of Design Guide D. As they are not recessed, nor part of the existing street scene
- k) The juliet balconies shown in the proposal will also cause overlooking, contrary of Design Guide D
- l) Hertfordshire County Council owns part of the car park, in which it would appear the developer would be building on
- m) We believe this application should therefore be called into Full Planning Committee, due to the numbers of objections and the impact on the surrounding area.

**5.e 22/1708/HSE - 89 Gills Hill Lane Radlett – Proposal: Part single/part two storey front, side, and rear extensions with integral garage following removal of side extension. Conversion of loft to habitable room with hip to gable roof alterations, rear dormer with Juliet balcony, and front roof light, and construction of outbuilding to rear garden.**

*Minutes:*

Object

- a) The new proposal does not maintain the building line at the front which is not compliant with SADM30
- b) There is insufficient car parking facilities
- c) It is in breach of Design Guide E KP-4 'Dormer windows should be as small as possible, providing light from the room rather than enabling a large amount of floorspace in the roof to be used. In most cases the dormer, should not take no more than 60% of the roof slope. Dormers should be located within the rear roof slope.'
- d) The proposal for the gable ended roof would balance up the appearance of the the two semis, although there would be an extended ridge line.

**5.f      22/1710/HSE - 47 Battlers Green Drive Radlett – Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension, first floor rear extension, conversion of loft to form habitable space including rear dormer and 2 roof lights to front and new front porch.**

*Minutes:*

Object

- a) The proposed rear elevation shows an extreme contrast between the two halves of this pair of semis and would seem to be rather inappropriate and non-compliant with the design principles of SADM30
- b) There is insufficient car parking spaces
- c) The additional roof in the loft relies on a full-width dormer which occupies the entire slope of the roof, contrary to the planning guidance of Part E EKP-4 'Dormer windows should be as small as possible and should not take no more than 60% of the roof slope'.

**5.g      22/1725/HSE - 20 Cobden Hill Radlett – Proposal: Single storey side and rear extensions. Alterations to roof to allow for additional habitable space in loft, alterations to fenestration and insertion of roof lights.**

*Minutes:*

No Objection

**5.h      22/1727/HSE - 10 Homefield Road Radlett – Proposal: Two storey rear extension and rear facing balcony, insertion of roof light to front, alterations to fenestration and front porch.**

*Minutes:*

No Objection

- 5.i 22/1627/HSE - 6 Kitswell Way Radlett – Proposal:  
Construction of new porch (revision to 20/2165/HSE).**

*Minutes:*

No Objection

- 5.j 22/1702/FUL - Phillimore Recreation Ground Gills Hollow  
Radlett – Proposal: Erection of a single storey cafe building  
with outdoor seating, community wood, and improved  
recreation ground entrance.**

- 6 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:*

These were noted.

- 6.a 22/1428/CLE - 26 Oakridge Avenue Radlett – Proposal:  
Removal of chimney stack. Certificate of Lawful Development  
(Existing).**

**7 Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council**

- 7.a 22/1387/HSE - Letchmore House, The Green, Letchmore  
Heath – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment  
was No Objection**

- 7.b 22/1386/HSE - 5 Watling Knoll, Radlett – HBC decision was  
Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection**

- 7.c 22/1183/HSE - Whitley Ridge, The Ridgeway, Radlett – HBC  
decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No  
Objection**

- 7.d 22/1225/VOC - 45 Newlands Avenue, Radlett – HBC decision  
was Grant Permission – APC comment was Object**

**8 Date of next meeting Monday 7th November 2022**

*Minutes:*

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.50pm.

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