

---

## **Planning Committee MINUTES**

**Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on Thursday, 11 December 2025 from 7.30 - 9.02 pm**

**Present:** Councillors Chris Whately-Smith (Chair), Harry Davies, Steve Drury, Philip Hearn, Stephen King, Chris Lloyd, Abbas Merali, Chris Mitchell and Debbie Morris

**Also in Attendance:**

Councillor Jon Tankard, Parish Councillor Diana Barber (Batchworth Community Council) and Councillor Oliver Cooper

**Officers in Attendance:**

Matthew Barnes, Principal Lawyer - Planning  
Emma Lund, Senior Committee Officer  
Matthew Roberts, Development Management Team Leader  
Kimberley Rowley, Head of Regulatory Services  
Scott Volker, Principal Planning Officer  
Claire Westwood, Development Management Team Leader

### **PC65/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology was received from Councillor Cooper who had expressed a wish to speak as a ward councillor on agenda item 8 (25/1294/FUL – Land Adjoining Sarratt Lane, Loudwater) and had decided to recuse himself as a Member of the Committee for this meeting to do so.

An apology for absence was also received from Councillor Gazzard.

### **PC66/25 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 20 November 2025 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **PC67/25 NOTICE OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **PC68/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **PC69/25 24/2089/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION; DRIVEWAY EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF GARAGE INTO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION AT 20 TOWNFIELD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 7DD**

The application was for construction of a single storey rear extension, driveway extension and conversion of garage into habitable accommodation at 20 Townfield, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that the application had first been considered at the Planning Committee in March, at which time the committee had resolved to grant planning permission. However, following a complaint (the details of which were summarised in the report) officers had considered it prudent to delay issuing planning permission and allow time to look into the matters raised. Following submission of an amended land ownership certificate (Certificate B) on a without-prejudice basis, and a re-consultation exercise, the Case Officer had provided their recommendation within the updated committee report which was now before the Committee.

The Planning Officer clarified that the applicant maintained the view that the land which was the subject of the application was owned by them. In support of this view a report had been submitted by A D S Property Services which concluded that Certificate B was not required. An adjoining neighbour had also submitted representations and documentation asserting that they owned part of the application site. However, on the basis that Certificate B had been submitted officers were content that the application could now be determined. The Planning Officer confirmed that other than the submission of Certificate B there were no other changes to the application which had been considered in March.

A local resident spoke against the application.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

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

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

- There were examples within Townfield of other garage conversions and extensions, albeit not within the same terrace as the application. However, these single storey rear extensions were to properties which were staggered. The application site was set back within the stagger, and therefore there was potential in this case for the extension to be more impactful. However, the assessment of Planning Officers was that the proposal would not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties and that the depth of 3.6m, along with the proposed height and design, was acceptable. It was also in accordance with the Local Plan. The Planning Officer commented that in assessing the application officers had had regard to the wider context of Townfield as a whole, rather than just the individual terrace of properties in which the application site was situated.
- It was acknowledged that the proposal would result in a slight shortfall (14 sqm) in amenity space. However, this was not considered by officers to be of a level which would be harmful. Officers considered that the proposal would provide suitable usable amenity for everyday living which would not adversely affect the occupants. A Committee Member proposed that in light of the amenity shortfall a condition to remove Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E permitted development rights should be added in the event that the planning permission was granted, in order to prevent further development in the future.
- A Committee Member commented that many garages within the district (including those at Townfield) were no longer of a sufficient size to accommodate modern vehicles and consequently were not used for their intended purpose.
- In response to a point raised by a speaker about the impact on the neighbouring properties and any possible detriment to privacy, officers responded that whilst the proposal would obviously affect views from the rear elevation of the property, the views from the proposed extension would not be different to the existing and therefore would

have no impact on privacy. The impact on neighbouring properties was not considered to be detrimental for the reasons set out in the report.

Councillor Hearn moved, and Councillor Morris seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and an additional condition removing Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E permitted development rights. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being unanimous.

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and an additional condition removing Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E permitted development rights.

**PC70/25 PRELIMINARY REPORT 25/0484/OUT – OUTLINE APPLICATION:  
ERECTION OF UP TO 75 NEW DWELLINGS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WITH  
ASSOCIATED ACCESS ONTO CHALFONT ROAD (APPEARANCE, LAYOUT,  
LANDSCAPING AND SCALE AS RESERVED MATTERS) AT LAND AT NORTH OF  
CHALFONT ROAD, CHALFONT ROAD, MAPLE CROSS, HERTFORDSHIRE**

The Committee received a preliminary report on an outline application for the erection of up to 75 new dwellings, parking and landscaping with associated access onto Chalfont Road (Appearance, Layout, Landscaping and Scale as reserved matters) at Land at North of Chalfont Road, Chalfont Road, Maple Cross.

The Committee was invited to note the report, comment on any material planning considerations and consider undertaking a site visit. The application would be brought back to the Committee at a later date for determination.

The Planning Officer provided an update that correction was required to paragraph 8.1.22 of the report to clarify that due the amount of hedging and vegetation which would be lost, the proposal would not provide a link to Footpath 008 but only to Footpath 009. The applicant had provided a markup plan highlighting all tree and hedge removals (both partial and full) in response to comments from the Highway Authority: these were covered at paragraph 8.17.5 of the report and a plan was included in the presentation to the committee.

A local resident spoke against the application.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Committee Members asked questions about the detail of the proposal which were responded to by officers. Members' comments included the following:

- A speaker drew attention to regular localised flooding at the site location, the potential impact on vehicular access, and flood risk to neighbouring properties arising from the proposal. The view was expressed that the flood risk assessment did not comprehensively cover the threat which was posed. Additionally, the drains were not adequately maintained and therefore flooding represented a greater risk than had been accounted for. Comment was also made that there was a risk in relation to foul water and sewage and a lack of drain capacity; that the traffic assessments did not accurately reflect the congestion experienced on Chalfont Road; and that a development of 300 houses in Buckinghamshire would further impact on road capacity. Committee Members considered that full details on these issues should be covered in the officer report when the application comes to the committee for determination.
- It was requested that details of the road and water infrastructure improvements mentioned by the applicant be included in the officer report, as well as further details of the play equipment to be provided (including maintenance arrangements); car parking provision and EV charging facilities; the attenuation pond; access issues; and the energy strategy for the site. A Committee Member expressed the view that there should be compulsory EV charging for every property.

- Committee Members' comments also included that it was important to retain as much hedging as possible; that assurance should be sought in relation to the proportion of affordable housing to be provided, in order to try to ensure that this was not reduced by the developer at a later date; that the option of moving the site entrance further westwards, or siting the open space closer to Oakhill Road, be considered in order to reduce the impact on properties in Oakhill Road; that the option of moving the attenuation pond be considered due to its visual impact; and that a requirement for obscured glazing be considered to prevent any overlooking of properties in Oakhill Road.
- Officers clarified that whilst the wider site was Green Belt, the parcel of land which formed the application site had been assessed as Grey Belt for the reasons set out in the report. The reasons for Maple Cross not being considered a large built-up area were addressed at paragraph 8.1.11.
- A Committee Member questioned the sustainability of the site location given that it was 5km from Rickmansworth Station, the cycle routes to other transport hubs and employment sites were difficult, and buses were often impacted by the congestion on Chalfont Road. The Committee Member also commented that the facilities to be provided on the site appeared to be minimal, with the only public benefit seeming to be housing and a small amount of open space. Public amenity in the form of green space, walks, and play areas already existed in the nearby vicinity.
- A Committee Member commented that a condition requiring a permanent wheel washing facility should be required as part of any planning consent.

By general assent the Committee agreed the recommendations as set out in the report.

**RESOLVED:** that

- 1) Members agree for officers to arrange a site visit prior to this application being presented to Planning Committee for a decision; and
- 2) the Committee notes the report and makes general comments with regards to the material planning issues raised by the application as set out above.

**PC71/25 25/1182/RSP – PART RETROSPECTIVE: VARIATION OF CONDITION 13 (SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE SCHEME TO BE SUBMITTED) AND CONDITION 20 (COMPLIANCE WITH SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE SCHEME MITIGATION) PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION 23/0701/OUT TO ALLOW ALTERATIONS TO POND DEPTH AT LAND TO SOUTH OF FOXGROVE PATH/HEYSHAM DRIVE, SOUTH OXHEY, WATFORD WD19 6YL**

The application was part retrospective for variation of Condition 13 (Surface Water Drainage Scheme to be submitted) and Condition 20 (Compliance with Surface Water Drainage Scheme Mitigation) pursuant to outline planning permission 23/0701/OUT to allow alterations to pond depth at Land To South Of Foxgrove Path/Heysham Drive, South Oxhey.

The Planning Officer clarified that the drainage pond which formed part of the approved sustainable drainage scheme had been constructed deeper than was set out within the approved outline planning application. The Lead Local Flood Authority had raised no objection to the increased depth of the pond, which would allow greater capacity as a result.

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

**RESOLVED:** that retrospective outline planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

**PC72/25 25/1294/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF 9NO. RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3), WITH ASSOCIATED REROUTING OF PUBLIC FOOTPATH, ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WORKS AT LAND ADJOINING SARRATT LANE, LOUDWATER, HERTFORDSHIRE**

The application was for construction of 9no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3), with associated rerouting of public footpath, access, parking and landscaping works at Land Adjoining Sarratt Lane, Loudwater.

The Planning Officer provided the following updates:

- Further to the publication of the report, two additional ecology reports had been received. These related to dormice and badgers. Having reviewed their findings, officers were satisfied that the matter could be dealt with by condition, and as such reason for refusal 5 (ecology) would fall away.
- Ecology would also be removed from the weightings at the end of the report which were summarised in the table at 7.15.22. However, this did not change the overall conclusion and recommendation for refusal.
- One further objection had been received since the publication of the report. However, this did not raise any new material considerations which had not already been addressed in the report.
- Following its recent adoption, the Sarratt Neighborhood Plan was now to be afforded full weight as a material consideration. Relevant policies were considered to include:

Policies 2 (Design), 4 (Housing mix), 5 (AH), 6 (Biodiversity), 8 (RoW) and 10 (Car parking).

Reason for refusal 2 should be updated to include Policy 2 and the design guidance.

Reason for refusal 3 should be updated to include Policy 5 (AH).

Reason for refusal 6 should be updated to include Policy 10 (highways).

A local resident spoke against the application.

Councillor Oliver Cooper spoke on the application.

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

- A speaker commented that Sarratt Lane was a very narrow, single track lane with no pavement or street lighting and minimal passing places. The application site was therefore not appropriate for 9 large houses. Objections were made on the grounds of traffic congestion; unsuitability of the lane for heavy construction vehicles and the likely damage which would arise; the unsustainable location of the site; adverse impact on the character of the area; lack of infrastructure capacity; lack of compliance with the Sarratt Neighbourhood Plan; and ecology impacts of the proposal to divert the wooded public footpath. These comments were endorsed by Committee Members.
- A Committee Member noted that objections had been received from Sarratt Parish Council, Hertfordshire Highways, the Conservation Officer, the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Landscape Officer, as well as 71 public objections.
- A speaker commented that the site adjoined Chorleywood, which also had an up-to-date Neighbourhood Plan. In addition to the recently adopted Sarratt Neighbourhood Plan, the

proposal was also not compliant with a number of policies within the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan. Comment was also made that both areas had been subject to a number of applications which, had they all been approved, would have resulted in a level of housing delivery which would have by far exceeded their allocations.

Councillor Lloyd moved, and Councillor Drury seconded, that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report and with the following amendments:

- (i) removal of reason for refusal 5; and
- (ii) amendment of reasons for refusal 2, 3 and 6 to include reference to the Sarratt Neighbourhood Plan.

On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being unanimous.

**RESOLVED:** that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report and with the following amendments:

- (i) removal of reason for refusal 5; and
- (ii) amendment of reasons for refusal 2, 3 and 6 to include reference to the Sarratt Neighbourhood Plan.

**PC73/25 25/1851/FUL - VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 (PLANS) PURSUANT TO PLANNING PERMISSION 23/1619/FUL TO ALLOW THE OMISSION OF CENTRAL RIDGE SPANNING THE FRONT FACING GABLES, AND ALTERATION TO THE WINDOW BLADES ON THE FRONT ELEVATION AT GARAGES BETWEEN 83 AND 89 THE QUEENS DRIVE, MILL END**

The application was for variation of Condition 2 (plans) pursuant to planning permission 23/1619/FUL to allow the omission of the central ridge spanning the front facing gables, and alteration to the window blades on the front elevation at Garages Between 83 and 89 The Queens Drive, Mill End.

The Planning Officer provided an update that having reviewed the amended plans which reinstated the window blades, Chorleywood Parish Council had revised its comments to confirm that it had no objection to the proposal and had withdrawn its call-in.

A Committee Member commented the proposal represented an improvement on the previous design.

Councillor Morris moved, and Councillor King seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being unanimous.

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

**PC74/25 25/1852/FUL – VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 (PLANS) PURSUANT TO PLANNING PERMISSION 23/1569/FUL TO ALLOW REPOSITIONING OF BUILDING, ALTERATIONS TO THE PLACEMENT OF BALCONIES, ALTERATIONS TO WINDOWS, ERECTION OF DORMER ABOVE STAIRCASE, REMOVAL OF GREEN ROOF TO BIN/BIKE STORES AT GARAGES ADJACENT 13 TO 23 POLLARDS, MAPLE CROSS, HERTFORDSHIRE**

The application was for variation of Condition 2 (plans) pursuant to planning permission 23/1569/FUL to allow repositioning of building, alterations to the placement of balconies, alterations to windows, erection of dormer above staircase and removal of green roof to bin/bike stores at Garages Adjacent 13 To 23 Pollards, Maple Cross.

The Planning Officer clarified that the application sought to make minor changes to the planning approval previously granted. The approved plans included a single dormer window

to the rear elevation with a central recessed section and two dormers to the front elevation. It was proposed to replace the two approved front dormers with a single dormer with recessed section which would reflect that approved to the rear elevation.

The approved plans included recessed balconies to all flats across the ground, first and second floors, with the main elevations of those to the western end of the building facing the front and the main elevation of those to the eastern end of the building facing to the east (side). No changes were proposed to those to the western end of the building, however, the balconies to the eastern end were proposed to be re-orientated so that their main elevations would also face towards the front. There would be some associated alterations to fenestration to the front and flank as a result. The proposed changes would introduce a more symmetrical appearance to the front elevation than approved, however it was not considered that this would be harmful on character or appearance grounds. The reasons why the changes were considered acceptable from a character and amenity point of view were set out in the report.

It was also proposed to omit the green roof originally approved to the bin and bike store in order to comply with Building Regulations.

A Committee Member commented that the proposal represented an improvement to the approved application.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor Drury 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.

**PC75/25 25/1909/FUL – CREATION OF VEHICLE ACCESS AND DROPPED KERB ONTO HENDERSON PLACE AT 318 TOMS LANE, KINGS LANGLEY, HERTS WD5 0RB**

The application was for creation of vehicle access and dropped kerb onto Henderson Place at 318 Toms Lane, Kings Langley.

The Planning Officer provided updates as follows:

- The report should have included reference to Policy DM11 of the Development Management Policies Local Development Document, of which paragraph B stated that '*un-coordinated and ad-hoc proposals for vehicle crossovers which involve fragmentation and loss of grass verges and other spaces will be discouraged.*' In the event of approval Condition 2 would need to be updated to include reference to Policy DM11 in the reason for the condition.
- Condition 3 required an amendment to substitute '*before any building operations*' with '*before any above ground works*' and an informative should be included referring to the fact that the applicant would need to apply to Three Rivers District Council Property Services for approval for a crossover.

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

- A Committee Member noted that Condition 4 referred to a requirement that '*the development shall not be occupied until visibility splays have been provided in accordance with the approved details.*' It was agreed that this should be amended to refer to prior to first use of the crossover.

Councillor Drury moved, and Councillor King seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and the following amendments to conditions:

- an update to Condition 2 to refer to Policy DM11 of the Development Management Policies Local Development Document;
- an update to Condition 3 to refer to above ground works and an additional informative advising that consent from Three Rivers District Council Property Services was required; and
- an update to Condition 4 to require visibility splays to be provided prior to first use of the vehicle access following installation of the dropped kerb.

On being put to the vote this was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and the following amendments to conditions:

- an update to Condition 2 to refer to Policy DM11 of the Development Management Policies Local Development Document;
- an update to Condition 3 to refer to above ground works and an additional informative advising that consent from Three Rivers District Council Property Services was required; and
- an update to Condition 4 to require visibility splays to be provided prior to first use of the vehicle access following installation of the dropped kerb.

**CHAIR**