
Planning Committee MINUTES

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on Thursday, 23 January 2025 from 7.30 - 9.36 pm

Present: Councillors Chris Whately-Smith (Chair), Elinor Gazzard (Vice-Chair), Steve Drury, Chris Lloyd, Philip Hearn, Abbas Merali, Debbie Morris, Chris Mitchell, Stephen King and Louise Price

Officers in Attendance:

Matthew Barnes, Planning Solicitor
Clara Loveland, Senior Planning Officer
Emma Lund, Senior Committee Officer
Adam Ralton, Development Management Team Leader
Matthew Roberts, Development Management Team Leader
Kimberley Rowley,

External in Attendance:

Parish Councillor Diana Barber (Batchworth Community Council) and Jon Bishop (Chorleywood Parish Council)

PC92/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Harry Davies and Councillor Andrea Fraser.

Councillor Louise Price substituted for Councillor Harry Davies.

PC93/25 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2024 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC94/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Liberal Democrat Group declared a non-pecuniary interest in applications 24/1360/FUL and 24/1476/LBC as the agent is a member of the authority and a member of the Liberal Democrat Group.

Councillor Louise Price declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 11 (24/1799/RSP 24 Lynwood Heights, Rickmansworth) as she was acquainted with the applicants' son. Councillor Price left the room whilst the application was considered and did not participate in the debate or vote.

PC95/25 NOTICE OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

PC96/25 24/1348/FUL – TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, CONVERSION OF EXISTING GARAGE INTO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS; INSTALLATION OF FRONT ROOFLIGHT AND EXTENSION TO RAISED DECKING TO THE REAR AT CHILCOTE, 58 CLEMENTS ROAD, CHORLEYWOOD, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 5JT

The application was for a two-storey rear extension; conversion of existing garage into habitable accommodation; internal alterations; installation of front rooflight and extension to raised decking to the rear at Chilcote, 58 Clements Road, Chorleywood.

The application was brought to the Committee at the request of Chorleywood Parish Council, given concerns over the loss of elderly accommodation and privacy issues.

The Planning Officer reported that since the publication of the report amended plans had been received which resolved a minor discrepancy on the plans and included reference to the erection of a 1.8m high privacy screen to the edge of the proposed decking adjacent to the boundary with 56 Clements Road. In light of this, it was proposed to add a condition requiring installation of the privacy screen and for that screen to be maintained in perpetuity thereafter.

Parish Councillor Jon Bishop of Chorleywood Parish Council spoke on the application.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Lloyd moved and Councillor Morris seconded, that the application be approved subject to conditions and the addition of a further condition relating to the erection of a privacy screen. On being put to the vote this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: that the application be approved subject to conditions and the addition of a further condition relating to the erection of a privacy screen.

PC97/25 24/1360/FUL – CONSTRUCTION OF PITCHED ROOF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH ACCOMMODATION IN THE ROOFSpace AT SOLESBRIDGE HOUSE, SOLESBRIDGE LANE, CHORLEYWOOD, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 5SR

The application was for construction of a pitched roof single storey side extension with accommodation in the roofspace at Solesbridge House, Solesbridge Lane, Chorleywood.

The application was before the Committee as the agent for the application is a Three Rivers District Councillor.

The Planning Officer advised that there were no updates in relation to the application but clarified that the application for planning permission (agenda item 6) and the application for listed building consent (agenda item 7) were separate applications. The application for planning permission was recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the report and on the grounds of the adverse impact the extension would have on the character and the significance of the listed building. The application for listed building consent related to works which directly impacted the historic fabric of the building or affected its character as a building of special architectural and historic interest. In this case, the works which would attach the proposed extension to the existing building would involve alterations to a single storey projection which was constructed after 1958 and which was a modern structure. The proposed works were not considered to harm the building's special character and so the application for listed building consent was recommended for approval.

Applications 24/1360/FUL and 24/1476/LBC were debated together.

Committee members asked questions on the detail of the applications which were responded to by officers. The Committee's discussions included the following:

- Objections to the application for planning permission had been received from both the Conservation Officer and Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings.
- The scale and bulk of the proposal, and the obscuring of the view of the listed building were of concern.
- The harm to the heritage asset was not considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.

Councillor Hearn moved, and Councillor King seconded, that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer report. On being put to the vote this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: that the application be refused.

PC98/25 24/1476/LBC – LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: CONSTRUCTION OF PITCHED ROOF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH ACCOMMODATION IN THE ROOFSpace AT SOLESBRIDGE HOUSE, SOLESBRIDGE LANE, CHORLEYWOOD, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 5SR

The application was for listed building consent for construction of pitched roof single storey side extension with accommodation in the roofspace at Solesbridge House, Solesbridge Lane, Chorleywood.

The application was before the Committee as the agent for the application is a Three Rivers District Councillor.

The application was debated with application 24/1360/FUL above.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor Merali seconded, that listed building consent be granted subject to conditions. On being put to the vote, this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: that listed building consent be granted subject to conditions.

PC99/25 24/1479/FUL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT TWO STOREY DETACHED DWELLING WITH ACCOMMODATION WITHIN THE ROOF SERVED BY REAR DORMERS AT CARTREF, ORMONDE ROAD, MOOR PARK, NORTHWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE, HA6 2EJ

The application was for demolition of an existing dwelling and construction of replacement two storey detached dwelling with accommodation within the roof served by rear dormers at Cartref, Ormonde Road, Moor Park, Northwood.

The application was before the Committee as it had been called in by three members of the Planning Committee, unless officers were minded to refuse, due to plot coverage, siting and parking provision. The application had also been called in by Batchworth Community Council unless officers were minded to refuse, due to concerns over siting and plot coverage.

The Planning Officer gave the following updates:

- The updated Conservation Officer comments had been circulated to members earlier in the week. Following receipt of amended plans the Conservation Officer had maintained an objection, citing that the scheme would result in less than substantial harm to the Moor Park Conservation Area.
- An additional condition was recommended in order to prevent the use of the flat roof on the single storey rear element being used as a terrace.

- Condition 8 was not required as Class A permitted development rights were already to be removed by Condition 5. Condition 8 could therefore be removed.

Parish Councillor Diana Barber of Batchworth Community Council spoke against the application.

Elaine Tooke of Moor Park (1958) Limited spoke against the application.

Committee members asked questions about details of the application which were responded to by officers. The Committee's discussions included the following:

- The increase in the percentage of plot coverage arising from the proposal was considered to be significant and in excess of the maximum which was considered acceptable within the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal, notwithstanding that the latter figure was for guidance only.
- The proposal would involve significant increases to both the full roof ridge height and the property width and depth compared to existing, in what was considered to be a small infill plot.
- The view from the streetscene was currently protected by mature trees and the proposal involved moving the property circa 1.5m closer to the road. The trees fronting the streetscene were not considered to have an amenity value and were proposed for removal. This would be mitigated by replacement planting, details of which would need to be submitted by the applicant. Measures to protect trees during construction would be conditioned.
- Weight should be given to the Conservation Officer's objection and comments that the proposal was not in keeping with the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal guidelines.
- There had to date been no objections from neighbouring properties.
- The proposal arguably offered potential for public benefit through the replacement of an older property with a more sustainable and energy efficient building. A Committee Member commented that the benefits of energy efficiency measures could still be achieved in a smaller scale development which was more appropriate to the plot size. Another Committee Member commented that there were carbon costs associated with the demolition and replacement of a building and that the balance of doing so compared to retrofitting an existing property were not clear cut.

Councillor Morris moved, and Councillor Merali seconded, that the application be refused by virtue of the replacement dwelling's scale, width and bulk resulting in an unduly prominent replacement dwelling and overdevelopment of the plot. On being put to the vote this was carried, the vote being 6 in favour and 4 against.

RESOLVED: that the application be refused, with the reason for refusal to be circulated to Committee Members for agreement before the decision is issued.

PC100/25 24/1614/FUL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND SHED AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY DETACHED DWELLING INCLUDING BASEMENT LEVEL WITH SWIMMING POOL AND ACCOMMODATION IN THE ROOFSpace SERVED BY REAR DORMER WINDOW AND FRONT/SIDE/REAR ROOFLIGHTS, SIDE SOLAR PANELS WITH ASSOCIATED HEATPUMP, ACCESS, BIN AND BIKE STORE, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WORKS AND VEHICLE CROSS OVER AT 20 BATCHWORTH LANE, NORTHWOOD, HA6 3DR

The application was for the demolition of an existing dwelling and shed and construction of two storey detached dwelling including basement level with swimming pool and

accommodation in the roofspace served by rear dormer window and front/side/rear rooflights, side solar panels with associated heatpump, access, bin and bike store, parking and landscaping works and vehicle cross over at 20 Batchworth Lane, Northwood.

The application was before the Committee as it had been called in by Batchworth Community Council if officers were minded to approve for the reasons set out in the officer report.

The Planning Officer gave the following updates and drew attention to the following points:

- Since publication of the report the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) had raised no objection to the scheme, which it considered a betterment of the existing circumstance. However, it had proposed two conditions which were: (i) a surface water drainage strategy and (ii) a construction phase surface water management plan. Condition 3 within the report already required a pre-commencement surface water strategy; an additional condition was recommended to be attached to any grant of permission to require a construction phase surface water management plan.
- An amendment had been made to the rear second access off Eastbury Road where the gates had now been set back by a further metre (previously proposed at 5m positioning now proposed at 6m positioning). As a result of this the Highways Authority had removed its objection to the scheme on the basis that the setback positioning of the rear gates was no longer of concern and the relocation of the access was considered as relocation of an existing access rather than an additional access. There were therefore now no Highways objections to the proposal.
- Changes made following the previous refusal were summarised as: addition of brickwork to the large glazing to the front gable; lowering of the ridge height by 0.7m; removal of the rear garage from the site; and further setting back of the rear gates to Eastbury Road. Additionally, the front access which was previously proposed as a pedestrian access was now proposed as a vehicular access.

A local resident spoke against the application.

The agent spoke in favour of the application.

Parish Councillor Diana Barber of Batchworth Community Council spoke against the application.

Committee members asked questions on the details of the application which were responded to by officers. The Committee's discussions included the following:

- A pre-commencement condition had been included requiring piling details and methodology to be submitted. Some Committee Members expressed concern about the potential impact of the extent of the piling which would be needed, and the potential impact on neighbouring properties.
- A pre-commencement condition requiring a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted, including number of vehicles, types, routing, access and traffic management arrangements was conditioned. Notwithstanding this, Committee Members remained concerned about the construction management implications given the size of the development, the amount of spoil to be removed and the busy nature of the surrounding roads and junction. It was recommended that officers should seek further detail with regard to the CMP and look at how the number and timing of lorry movements per day may be restricted and how the impact of construction on neighbours and highway users could be mitigated.
- The rear access arrangements would require the addition of a dropped kerb and removal of part of the verge. This would require the consent of the Highways Authority. Given

that sufficient parking for the size of the property would not be provided in the event that this consent were not given, it was suggested that a requirement to complete the vehicular access should be made a pre-commencement, rather than pre-occupation, condition. It was also suggested that a hard surface should be provided on site adjacent to the new access before works commenced, to allow construction work to take place.

- The proportion of glazing to the front elevation was still substantial despite the amendment and some Committee Members considered that it was still not in character, although Batchworth Lane included properties of a variety of styles.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor King seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and: amendment to Condition 11 to require fulfillment before works commence rather than before first occupation; amendment to Condition 13 to require hardstanding for parking during construction activities before commencement of works; an additional condition requiring the existing access from Eastbury Road to be closed up, the verge replaced and the dropped kerb raised before first occupation; addition of a permitted development restriction to Condition 10 such that a means of enclosure was not permitted; and amendment to Condition 5 to require temporary screening during the construction phase. On being put to the vote the motion fell, the voting being 1 in favour, 6 against and 3 abstentions.

Councillor Lloyd moved, and Councillor Hearn seconded, that the application be deferred to allow officers to seek further amendments with regards to the extent of glazing, further information on construction management, phasing approach during construction and access arrangements. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 7 in favour and 3 abstentions.

RESOLVED: that the application be deferred to allow officers to seek further amendments with regards to the extent of glazing, further information on construction management, phasing approach during construction and access arrangements.

PC101/25 24/1725/FUL - VARIATION OF CONDITIONS 1 (HOURS OF OPERATION) AND 2 (EXTERNAL USE HOURS) PURSUANT TO PLANNING APPLICATION 12/1452/FUL: TO ALLOW THE CAFE TO OPERATE BETWEEN 08:00 TO 22:00 EVERY DAY AT 16 MONEY HILL PARADE, UXBRIDGE ROAD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 7BE

The application was for variation of Conditions 1 (Hours of Operation) and 2 (External Use Hours) pursuant to planning application 12/1452/FUL to allow the cafe to operate between 08:00 to 22:00 every day at 16 Money Hill Parade, Uxbridge Road, Rickmansworth.

The application was before the Committee as part of the application site is under the ownership of the Council.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates in relation to the application.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor Lloyd seconded, that planning permission be approved. On being put to the vote this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be approved.

PC102/25 24/1799/RSP - PART RETROSPECTIVE: DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF A REPLACEMENT TWO-STOREY DETACHED DWELLING WITH ROOF ACCOMMODATION SERVED BY ROOF LIGHTS; INSTALLATION OF SOLAR PANELS AND AN AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP. LANDSCAPING ALTERATIONS AND REAR PATIO; PROVISION OF HARDSTANDING; RETENTION OF EXISTING SWIMMING POOL; ASSOCIATED CYCLE AND REFUSE

STORAGE AT 24 LYNWOOD HEIGHTS, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 4ED

The application was part retrospective for demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of a replacement two-storey detached dwelling with roof accommodation served by roof lights; installation of solar panels and an air source heat pump; landscaping alterations and rear patio; provision of hardstanding; retention of existing swimming pool; associated cycle and refuse storage at 24 Lynwood Heights, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that planning permission had been granted for extensions to the property under a previous application. Due to the extent of demolition which had taken place, planning permission was now required for reconstruction along with the extensions. The scheme now before the Committee contained some additions above the extent of the extensions previously approved. These were set out in the officer report, but the Planning Officer summarised that they principally comprised a single storey rear extension which was larger in the current scheme than that previously approved, and an increase to the height of the dwelling of 0.6m.

The agent spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Price left the meeting room.

Committee Members asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers. In response to a question the Planning Officer advised that the increased ridge height was comparable with neighbouring houses and would not represent a departure from the roof heights of surrounding properties in any significant way.

Councillor Morris moved and Councillor Whately-Smith seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions. On being put to the vote this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

CHAIR