



ALDENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

DRAFT Minutes Planning Committee

Date 18/11/2024
Time 19:30 - 21:30
Location Meeting Room 2, The Radlett Centre, 1 Aldenham Avenue, Radlett WD7 8HL
Chair Cllr S Khawaja
Attendees Cllrs E Samuelson, S Benjamin, S Howard & G Taylor (Co-Opted Member)
Officer S Heighton (Admin – OS & Planning)

1 Apologies for absence

Minutes:

Apologies were received from Cllrs C Woolf & W Susman.

2 Declarations of interest on any item on the Agenda – None.

3 To confirm the Minutes and appendices of the meeting held on Monday 4th November 2024

Minutes:

The minutes of the meeting were confirmed and signed by Cllr S Khawaja 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:

There were no members of public present.

5 Planning Applications

5.a 24/1389/HSE - 2 The Ridgeway, Radlett – Proposal: Construction of single storey side and rear extension to include terrace above and 2x rooflights. Alterations to front porch and fenestration. Partial conversion of garage to habitable space to include alterations to fenestration. Alterations to hard and soft landscaping

Minutes:

No Objection - but members note that the terrace may give rise to overlooking and reduce the amenity of the neighbours.

5.b 24/1390/HSE - 3 Summerhouse Lane, Aldenham, Watford – Proposal: Erection of children's climbing frame. (Retrospective application)

Minutes:

No Objection - once all the recommendations in the arboricultural report have been satisfied.

5.c 24/0809/FUL - 58 Watford Road, Radlett – Proposal: Demolition of existing house and construction of two pairs of two storey 4- bedroom semi-detached dwellings including associated landscaping

Minutes:

Object -

- a) The proposal does not comply with SADM30, Design Guide E, in terms of scale, mass and bulk and is considered an over development of the site. The 2 buildings would represent around 24% of the site area, whereas the average for Radlett is 11%.
- b) The car parking spaces look too small, as average car width is around 2m. This would only leave 0.5m for car doors to open. This would be contrary to SADM 40 - where the parking layout would not adequately enable the vehicle parking spaces to be independent of each other for this level of parking. There are also no visitors parking spaces.

5.d 24/1409/HSE - Silver Birches , Gills Hill Lane, Radlett – Proposal: Demolition of existing rear conservatory, construction of single storey rear extension with roof lantern, side and rear first floor extensions above existing single storey extensions, and infill conservatory. Conversion of loft to habitable space with associated roof alterations to include rear crown roof, insertion of 3x rear rooflights and removal of 2x chimney stacks. Alterations to fenestration

Minutes:

Object --

- a) The drawings do not show the scale of the application, especially spacing to the boundary with its neighbours clearly. The boundary with Wisteria seems to be below 1m at ground floor level, and this would automatically mean that it will contravene the 2m spacing needed at first floor level on both sides.
- b) There is also no site plan submitted, showing the relationship to neighbours.

5.e 24/1402/FUL - 56 Aldenham Avenue, Radlett – Proposal: Demolition of existing detached dwelling and garage to

facilitate construction of detached two storey dwelling to include habitable space in the roof space and attached garage store. Associated hard and soft landscaping. New site access and front boundary treatment including EV charging point

Minutes:

Object --

- a) This application is contrary to SADM 30 in relation to mass, bulk and height and will dominate the street scene, especially as the ridge height is more than 1m higher than No 54.
- b) The proposal contravenes the requirement of spacing to the boundary to be 2m at first floor; it is less than that on both sides. This contravenes the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan Design Code E - Spacing between Building and Boundary.
- c) Hertsmere Borough Council does not normally allow dormers in the front of a house.
- d) The siting of the house will create a large expanse of the flank wall to No 58, breaking the 45° rule.
- e) The demolition will be seen as a loss to the street scene which is contrary to the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan Policy HD3 - Respecting and Enhancing Local Townscape and Landscape Character and Patterns. The proposal is also contrary to Design Guide D para, 8.2.1 and 8.2.2 para L.

5.f 24/1422/HSE - 37 Homefield Road, Radlett – Proposal: Construction of single storey rear extension and first floor side extension

Minutes:

Object --

- a) The plans show that the proposed 1st floor side extension would only be 1.5m from the boundary. A minimum of 2m is required which contravenes Design Guide E and the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan Design Code E - Spacing Between Building and Boundary, which requires sufficient space between dwellings.

5.g 24/1136/VOC - Land Between Orchard House And Laurel Cottage , New Road, Letchmore Heath, Watford – Proposal: Application for variation of conditions 2 (Plans), 4 (Bike store) and 5 (Means of enclosure) to allow for Increase dwelling size, inclusion of conservatory room and construction work variations following grant of planning permission 23/1599/FUL

Minutes:

Object - The APC Planning Committee reiterates its previous comments and supports those of Letchmore Heath Village Trust,

copied below:

Letchmore Heath Village Trust objects to this application and urges the Council to refuse permission for the following reasons:

Green Belt: Application 23/1599 permitting construction of a dwelling house was acceptable and the Trust raised no objection. That permission struck a reasonable balance between sensitive development of the site while safeguarding the environment. Permitted development rights were rightly withdrawn so as to preserve the character and appearance of the area and to prevent additional development within the Green Belt, resulting in harm to its openness.

Conservation Area: The application site is located within Letchmore Heath Conservation Area and this proposal would give rise to undue harm to its setting and would fail to protect and conserve the character and appearance of the street scene. Indeed, the original scheme was amended prior to granting 23/1599 following comments from Place Services Conservation Advice. This was to ensure the scale, form, appearance and proportions of the dwelling were consistent with and preserved the character of this part of New Road, particularly as regards the neighbouring nineteenth century dwellings and to prevent undue harm to the Conservation Area.

Size and Scale: This proposal seeks approval for a very much larger dwelling than permitted by 23/1599 – over 25% larger- and is certainly not of a scale and design which respects its immediate surroundings and the local pattern of development. This would be contrary to the Core Strategy 2013 and Policies SADM 3 SADM26 and SADM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016. Whereas the original design allowed sat reasonably comfortably within its plot with clear sky gaps the additional size proposed very substantially closes the gap between the new dwelling and Laurel Cottage. The Trust draws attention to:

- The Schedule of Accommodation with this application is incorrect as it completely omits the Conservatory. It is the same Schedule sent in with 23/1085/VOC showing a floor area of 139.98 sq.m. However, the Conservatory at approx. 13 sq. m means this proposal would result in floor space of around 153 sq m – an unacceptable uplift of around a quarter of the dwelling authorised under 23/1599/FUL
- The stated gap in the Officer's report to Committee on 23/1599 is not 6 metres but under half that and this proposal must be view accordingly. This gap will be further narrowed on completion of the yet to be finalised works at Laurel Cottage referred to below which extends almost to their boundary. The Conservatory in this application leaves a gap of around only 60 cm from the boundary with Laurel Cottage and is far too close.

Residential Amenity: The Trust has concerns relating to impact on residential amenity. Policy SADM3 and SADM30 state that developments should not have an adverse impact on the privacy, outlook and amenity of neighbouring residents. Part D of the Planning and Design Guide SPD states that new development should not breach a 45° line drawn from the neighbouring habitable room windows. The Trust does not have access to the site but from the plans it seems that this rule may well be breached particularly as Laurel Cottage to the right has the benefit of a non-expired planning permission to extend sideways towards this property with clear fenestration at first floor level, and it is believed already has existing clear glass windows elsewhere on that flank wall. We also note that a window overlooking Orchard House is now to be clear with unrestricted opening. The Council's attention is drawn to condition 10 of 23/1599 requiring all side windows to be obscure.

Noise: The Trust previously requested a noise condition for plant and equipment and this has been imposed. But the Trust has concerns that a larger property will require a larger heat pump and were this application to be granted would ask the Council to impose further noise reduction measures to include insulation casing.

6 Planning decisions by Hertsmere Borough Council

Minutes:

These were noted.

6.a 24/0869/VOC - 3 Loom Place, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection

6.b 23/1803/FUL - 1 Loom Lane, Radlett – HBC decision was Grant Permission – APC comment was No Objection

7 Date of next meeting Monday 2nd December 2024

Minutes:

There being no business the meeting finished at 8.25pm.

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