



Minutes Planning Committee

Date 09/01/2023
Time 19:30 - 21:30
Location Meeting Room 2
Chair Cllr M Cherry
Attendees Cllrs E Samuelson, A Robinson & G Taylor(co-opted member)
Officer S Heighton (Admin – OS)

Also present was 14 members of the public and 1 Borough Councillor

1 Apologies for absence

Minutes:

Apologies were received from Cllr S Khawaja

2 Declarations of interest on any item on the Agenda

Minutes:

None

3 To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd November 2022 and Delegated Decisions of the 5th & 19th December 2022

Minutes:

The minutes of the meeting on 22 November and delegated decisions on 5th and 19th December were confirmed and signed by Cllr M Cherry as a true record of those meetings

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 members of the public could address the committee. 13 members of the public raised concerns regarding agenda item 5.e, 22/1539/OUT - Land South of Shenley Hill and 1 member of the public raised concerns regarding agenda item 6.a, 22/2118/LBC - Barn on Land Surrounding Kemprow Farm. 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 agenda item 5.e, was considered next and agenda item 6.a after, which was agreed.

5 Planning Applications

- 5.a 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. (Amended Plans Received 16/12/22)**

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.b 22/2085/HSE - 21 Letchmore Road, Radlett – Proposal: Instillation of air conditioning plant on roof. (Retrospective application)**

Minutes:

Object --The air conditioning plant being added is not in keeping with the roof lines or the street scene.

- 5.c 22/2096/HSE - 26 Craigweil Avenue Radlett – Proposal: Conversion of loft to form habitable space with front, side and rear dormers, insertion of 2 x front, 1 x side and 1 x central rooflights and associated roof alterations, to include raising the ridge height, steepening the pitch and increasing the eaves overhang**

Minutes:

Object --The proposal is in contravention to the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan as it is an identified bungalow.

- 5.d 22/2103/FUL - 43 Newlands Avenue Radlett – Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement detached 6 bedroom dwelling with accommodation at roof and basement level**

Minutes:

Object -- APC ask that the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide D is complied with, which states ' Ensuring that new homes are signed such that spaces in front of them contribute to the verdant character of the area. Ensuring that hard surface coverage within housing plots be limited and that hard surfacing be permeable. Achieving biodiversity gains and actions to prevent flood risk', as it looks like a revision to the front parking area.

5.e 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. Outline application to include the matter of ACCESS (with the following matters reserved: APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT and SCALE)

Minutes:

Object -- APC objected to this application previously and our comments still stand:

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 SADM10, Biodiversity and Habitats on 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 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. Road access from Radlett to the site would be lengthy as, other than a new footpath linking to Williams Way. The route is a long way round for vehicles, via Shenley Hill which 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, where it will be less than 1km from Shenley.

d) There would be 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 and would be dangerous as stated 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 the 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 9am. 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) This application has considerable opposition from the local community and we would like to be notified as to when the Committee hearing will take place.

**5.f 22/2122/HSE - 10 Homefield Road Radlett – Proposal:
Construction of a two storey rear extension with rear balcony,
single storey side extension and new front porch. Conversion
of garage to habitable space to include new timber cladding,
insertion of front roof light and alterations to fenestration**

Minutes:

No Objection

**5.g 22/2124/HSE - 5 The Woods Radlett – Proposal: Construction
of a first floor rear extension and alterations to fenestration**

Minutes:

No Objection - although we would like the 1st floor extension to comply with the 45° angle as we are unable to tell from the drawings

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

6.a 22/2118/LBC - 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. Demolition of buildings and structures and associated landscaping. (Reassessment of amended proposals following Judicial Review ruling quashing listed building consent 20/2011/LBC). (Accompanied by Planning Permission Application 22/2098/FUL re-assessing 20/2010/FUL)

Although APC had not received the notice for application 22/2098/FUL the following comments are made on this application; APC welcome the restoration to the barn, although the red line is deemed too excessive, to take out agricultural land and put it into residential garden, which seems inappropriate. The consultation was over the Christmas period and not acceptable, as people have not had time to look at it.

6.b 22/2024/CLE - 107 Watling Street Radlett – Proposal: Change of use from residential to health care practice, to include conversion of garage to habitable space. Certificate of Lawful Development (Existing)

7 Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

7.a 22/1627/HSE - 6 Kitswell Way, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection

7.b 22/1887/HSE - 57 Goodyers Avenue, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection

7.c 22/1847/HSE - 2 Back Lane, Letchmore Heath, Watford – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection

- 7.d 22/1787/HSE - 47A Oakridge Avenue, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection**
- 7.e 22/1817/HSE - Malden, Back Lane, Letchmore Heath, Watford – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection**
- 7.f 21/1678/FUL - 58 Watford Road, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection**
- 7.g 22/0403/HSE - 39 Watford Road, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was Object**
- 7.h 22/1369/FUL - 23 Homefield Road, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was Object**
- 7.i 22/1470/FUL - 18 Watford Road, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection**
- 7.j 22/1803/HSE - 50 Willow Way, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission - APC comment was Object**
- 7.k 22/1136/HSE - 30 Newberries Avenue, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was Object**
- 7.l 22/1653/HSE - 19 Oakridge Avenue, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was Object**
- 8 Date of next meeting Monday 23rd January 2023**

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.15pm

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