
Planning Committee MINUTES

**Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on
Wednesday, 27 May 2026 from 7.30 - 9.27 pm**

Present: Councillors Chris Whately-Smith (Chair), Elinor Gazzard, Oliver Cooper, Stephen Cox, Raj Khiroya, Debbie Morris, Reena Ranger, Narinder Sian and Tom Smith

Also in Attendance:

Parish Councillors Diana Barber (Batchworth Community Council), Jon Bishop (Chorleywood Parish Council), Andrew Gallagher (Croxley Green Parish Council) and Jon Tankard (Abbots Langley Parish Council)

Officers in Attendance:

Emma Lund, Senior Committee Officer
Tom Norris, Senior Planning Officer
Matthew Roberts, Development Management Team Leader
Kimberley Rowley, Head of Regulatory Services
Claire Wilson, Principal Planning Officer

PC135/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mitchell, who was replaced by Councillor Sian for this meeting only.

PC136/25 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 23 April 2026 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC137/25 NOTICE OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

PC138/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Khiroya declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 11 (26/0373/ADV – 15 Money Hill Parade, Rickmansworth), having a business interest in a property located opposite the application site.

Councillor Sian declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 (26/0073/RSP – 9 The Crescent, Croxley Green) as he had been previously involved with the application. Councillor Sian stated that he would leave the room whilst the application was discussed and would not participate in determining it.

PC139/25 25/0590/FUL – CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO CREATE 4 GYPSY AND TRAVELLER PITCHES INCLUDING 2 AMENITY BUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED HARDSTANDING AND ACCESS AT LAND TO THE NORTH OF TOMS LANE, KINGS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE

The application was for change of use of land to create 4 gypsy and traveller pitches including 2 amenity buildings and associated hardstanding and access at Land to the North of Toms Lane, Kings Langley.

The Planning Officer provided updates as follows:

- Officers considered it reasonable to add a condition to require that the new gated entrance shall at all times only open inwards towards the application site rather than outwards towards Toms Lane, for highways safety reasons.
- A condition requiring on-site cycle storage should also be secured and made available for use by future occupants prior to first occupation of the development.
- A further condition securing a fire hydrant on site was also required, to ensure that the development was adequately served in the event of a fire. This would address concerns raised by Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue Service as outlined in the report.

Parish Councillor Jon Tankard of Abbots Langley Parish Council spoke against the application.

The agent spoke in favour of the application.

Points raised by the speaker against the application included: the character of the area was suburban rather than semi-rural and the application and change of use was not in keeping with the suburban character of Toms Lane; an un-related recent application at another site on Toms Lane had been refused by the committee on the basis of concerns which included intensification and the impact on the linear pattern of Toms Lane. Consistency of approach was therefore needed with this application; and there were also concerns about contamination arising from the site's previous use.

Points raised by the speaker in favour of the application included: the application would provide good quality accommodation for a family, and would also free up two pitches on the Sandy Lane site for families who could not afford to develop their own site; there was an established need for gypsy and traveller pitches in the district; the site was Grey Belt and the proposal would not fundamentally undermine the purposes for including the land in Green Belt; and the site was a carefully-designed traveller site with a large area of screening and would retain verdant land at the back.

In response to the points raised by the speaker against the proposal, the Planning Officer set out the reasons why the site was considered to be Grey Belt and not Green Belt, as presented in the report, and the previous planning and appeal history which had informed the officers' view. The Planning Officer also highlighted the need for the application to be assessed on its own merits, noting that there were differences in context in relation to the nearby unrelated application which had recently been refused. In relation to contamination, there had been a requirement for an Environmental Phase One and Phase Two report to be submitted which had been assessed by an Environmental Health Officer who had concluded that the measures identified in the report could be adequately dealt with via planning condition.

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

- A Committee Member commented that the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites set out that the golden rules did not apply to traveller sites. There was therefore only a requirement for

the tests under paragraph 155 to be met. However, development of traveller sites in the Green Belt would be inappropriate on the same basis as other kinds of development. The issue of whether the site was Grey or Green Belt was therefore key. In response the Planning Officer summarised the reasons for the officers' assessment of the site as Grey Belt as set out in the report, noting that it was considered that the development would make a weak or no contribution to purposes (a), (b) or (d) of paragraph 143 of the NPPF and that the contribution towards purpose (c) was considered to be limited given the scale of the proposed development and the existing and enhanced screening. Additionally, the development would not result in conflict with purposes d) or e). As a result, the development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt when taken together. As such, it was considered that the application site constituted 'Grey Belt' land and would satisfy the first point of paragraph 155. In debate Committee Members generally supported the conclusion that the site was Grey Belt, noting that whilst Abbots Langley and Kings Langley could be considered to be marginally-sized towns, Bedmond was not a town, and the site itself would not result in the merging of neighbouring towns.

- A Committee Member expressed the view that great weight should be given to the need for gypsy and traveller pitches in the district. The proposal was well-designed and would be sited in a sustainable location with both a school and sports pavilion in close proximity. Additionally, it would make effective use of a parcel of land which would otherwise be difficult to develop.
- A Committee Member expressed concern that the screening of the site and the verdant land at the back may be eroded or removed over time and queried whether there was a mechanism by which retention of these features could be secured in order to prevent any visual harm. Additionally, it was considered that there was a risk that the use of the land to the front which was designated a garden may be subject to change, leading to visibility of domestic paraphernalia. Another Committee Member highlighted the risk of encroachment at the back of the site and questioned whether planning conditions may be added to prevent the area becoming messy. Officers responded that given that the hedgerow served a planning purpose, a Landscape Management Plan could be conditioned which would require the hedgerow to be replaced or replanted with similar native species if it should die or otherwise be removed and requiring ongoing management over the lifetime of the development. With regard to the grassland at the back, this formed an important function as part of the Biodiversity Net Gain and accordingly would need to be safeguarded to ensure that those habitats and the BNG were secured for 30 years. As the application was for residential use, planning permission would be required for any further development. However, if considered necessary a condition could be added requiring that no residential use, including station of caravans, parking, or placing of domestic paraphernalia should take place on any other part of the land defined by the hatched blue line shown on location plan (i.e. the land to the north). The reason for the condition would be to safeguard biodiversity management and enhancement over the 30 years.

Councillor Gazzard moved, and Councillor Khiroya seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and (i) additional conditions relating to the gated entrance, cycle storage, fire hydrant and restricting residential use to the application site; and (ii) amendment to condition 17 to include a landscape management plan.

On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 8 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and (i) additional conditions relating to the gated entrance, cycle storage, fire hydrant and restricting residential use to the application site; and (ii) amendment to condition 17 to include a landscape management plan.

PC140/25 25/0980/RSP – PART RETROSPECTIVE: REMOVAL OF ORIGINAL FRONT CANOPY PORCH; REMOVAL OF ORIGINAL CHIMNEY STACK; REMOVAL OF ORIGINAL RIDGE TILES AND FINIALS; REMOVAL OF ORIGINAL BARGEBOARDS; CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE-STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, INCLUDING NEW PORCH WITH NEW FRONT DOOR AND FENESTRATION AND WINDOW TO REPLACE GARAGE DOOR; REPLACEMENT WINDOWS; CONSTRUCTION OF NEW CHIMNEY STACK; CREAM PAINTED RENDER; REPLACEMENT RIDGE TILES AND FINIALS, CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED RAISED PATIO; REAR ROOFLIGHT; REMOVAL OF FRONT LANDSCAPING AND DRIVEWAY EXTENSION; AND ALTERATIONS TO FRONT BOUNDARY TREATMENT, INCLUDING BRICK SLIPS TO RENDERED FRONT WALLS AT SANDS, SHIRE LANE, CHORLEYWOOD, RICKMANSWORTH, HRTFORDSHIRE WD3 5NH

The application was part retrospective for removal of original front canopy porch; removal of original chimney stack; removal of original ridge tiles and finials; removal of original bargeboards; construction of single-storey front extension, including new porch with new front door and fenestration and window to replace garage door; replacement windows; construction of new chimney stack; cream painted render; replacement ridge tiles and finials, construction of single-storey rear extension and associated raised patio; rear rooflight; removal of front landscaping and driveway extension; and alterations to front boundary treatment, including brick slips to rendered front walls at Sands, Shire Lane, Chorleywood, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates.

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

Points raised by the speaker included: the size and design of the ground floor rear extension (particularly the extent of the glazing) was not in keeping with the existing property and would be harmful to the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area; this view was supported by the Conservation Officer; and there was no public benefit to offset the harm caused by the development.

The Planning Officer responded that the reason why the proposal was considered to be acceptable were set out within the report. It was clarified that the dormer window in the roof slope was excluded from the application, having been refused separately. The single storey rear extension did form part of the application, together with the retrospective changes at the front.

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

- A Committee Member expressed the view that many elements of the application were positive and would preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area, particularly in relation to those elements which were visible from the street. However, there were also parts of the application which were harmful.
- With regard to the objections raised by the Conservation Officer, the Planning Officer commented, in relation to the replacement of the previous timber-framed single glazed windows with UPVC, that the Planning Inspector had concluded at an appeal elsewhere in the Conservation Area that UPVC windows were acceptable. The addition of glazing bars was considered by officers to be a slight enhancement. Officers were therefore of the view that the windows did preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- In response to a question the Planning Officer clarified that the porch and the roof to the porch and the gabled front facing roof would be reconstructed to more closely resemble their appearance prior to the commencement of works, with the addition of a decorative barge

board, glazed front door and side fenestration. The roof above the converted garage would remain, but the roof material would be replaced by slate so that it matched the pre-existing and existing roof.

- In relation to the Conservation Officer's objection to the alterations to the driveway and the inclusion of gravel, a Committee Member commented that there were other gravel drives in the area. Another Committee Member supported the view that that the gravel was not unduly harmful. In response to a question from a Committee Member as to whether the applicant could be required to include some planting on the driveway, the Planning Officer responded that such a requirement was unlikely to be considered reasonable given the number of other gravelled or paved driveways in the area and the site's location closer to the High Street.
- With regard to the Conservation Officer's remaining objections, the Planning Officer confirmed that no changes were proposed to the garage windows. Additionally, the window to the first floor side extension was considered on balance to preserve the character and appearance of the overall dwelling.
- A Committee Member expressed the view that looked at overall, the effect of the proposal would be to restore the character of the property. Additionally, the rear extension would not be visible from the street and would enhance the performance of the building. Other Committee Members supported the view that the proposal preserved the character of the Conservation Area.

Councillor Cooper moved, and Councillor Whately-Smith seconded, that part-retrospective planning permission be granted subject to conditions. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 7 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

That part-retrospective planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

PC141/25 26/0033/FUL – EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING GROUND FLOOR AND EXTENSIONS TO CREATE FIRST AND SECOND FLOOR ACCOMMODATION, INCLUDING REAR DORMER WINDOW TO PROVIDE 1 SELF CONTAINED RESIDENTIAL DWELLING AT NO.1A GROVE ROAD, MILL END, RICKMANSWORTH WD3 8EB

The application was for extensions to existing ground floor and extensions to create first and second floor accommodation, including rear dormer window to provide 1 self-contained residential dwelling at no.1A Grove Road, Mill End, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that since publication of the agenda the Conservation Officer had advised that they had no objections. The Conservation Officer did not consider that the development would impact on the setting of the nearby listed building, the Waterside, which was located on the opposite side of Uxbridge Road.

The Planning Officer also reported that one further objection had been received, which had referenced loss of light, concerns regarding access and the existing driveway, lack of dimensions on the plan, lack of detail on submitted drawings, noise and disturbance, loss of privacy, traffic concerns and impact on waste and drainage. These issues had been raised in other objections and were addressed in full in the officer's report.

Finally, the Planning Officer reported that paragraph 3.7 of the report required updating to reflect an amendment received during the course of the application. This was that there would only be one space for commercial vehicles at the rear of the site and no provision for car parking for the residential use to the rear.

A local resident spoke against the proposal.

The agent spoke in favour of the proposal.

Points raised by the speaker against the proposal included: the harmful impact on neighbouring residents; concerns regarding congestion and increased vehicle movements; insufficient parking provision leading to overspill parking in surrounding streets affecting safety for local school children and access for existing residents; scale and design; loss of privacy; overlooking; reduced daylight; insufficient infrastructure and concern that the application was not for a genuine residential use, but to enable extended trading hours of the associated commercial property.

Points raised by the speaker in favour of the proposal included: the proposal represented an efficient use of brownfield land, using space above an existing commercial unit to create a new high quality residential unit which was compliant with both local and national planning policies; the proposal incorporated various sustainable design principles and biodiversity improvements, including landscaping improvements to the frontage; the proposal introduced a new facade which would enhance the architectural character of the area; and consideration and been given in the design to ensure the development was not overbearing and did not overlook neighbouring properties.

In response to the points raised by the speaker against the proposal, the Planning Officer reported that the property was the only single storey unit on Grove Road and was sited in a mixed location. When the building was increased in height it would not be any higher than the adjacent units and would not be out of context with the street scene. The NPPF encouraged the efficient use of land above existing built forms, and so from this point of view it was considered to be acceptable in the officers' view.

In relation to the parking provision, the Planning Officer commented that the parking arrangements associated with the existing use would not change, with access via Uxbridge Road to a parking space the rear of the site. The residential use would be a 2-bedroom unit which, in terms of policy, would generally require two off-street car parking spaces. However, given the sustainable location of the site which was within walking distance to local shops and services, schools, and a doctor's surgery on Uxbridge Road, officers considered that there were reasonable alternatives in terms of walking and cycling and that future occupiers would not necessarily be reliant on a private vehicle. For these reasons, officers considered the proposal to be acceptable in terms of parking. Additionally, there were double yellow lines which prevented parking outside the application site.

With regard to the concern expressed about change of use, it was noted that some changes of use would not necessarily require planning permission. In any event this would be a separate matter to the application before the Committee.

In relation to neighbouring amenity impact, it was acknowledged that the proposal would alter the outlook and potentially result in some loss of light affecting the flank windows at 1 Grove Road. However, officers did not believe that living conditions would be sufficiently affected as to justify refusal on those grounds. As the property was situated in an urban area there was inherently some overlooking between properties. However, the spacing between the units and the absence of flank windows would, in the officers' view, prevent an unacceptable impact. A requirement that no further windows be added, except by grant of planning permission, would be conditioned.

Councillor Morris moved, and Councillor Smith 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.

PC142/25 26/0073/RSP – PART RETROSPECTIVE: CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING HIP TO GABLE EXTENSION AND REAR DORMER AND FRONT/REAR ROOFLIGHTS AT 9 THE CRESCENT, CROXLEY GREEN, RICLMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 3DU

Councillor Sian left the meeting room.

The application was part retrospective for construction of two storey side extension, loft conversion including hip to gable extension and rear dormer and front/rear rooflights at 9 The Crescent, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer provided an update that condition 3 required amendment to include reference to No 8 (as well as No 10) in order to require the tile hanging to be applied to both dormer flanks, in accordance with the plans.

A local resident spoke against the application.

Parish Councillor Andrew Gallagher of Croxley Green Parish Council spoke on the application.

Points raised by the speakers against the application included: concerns about privacy and overlooking of neighbouring gardens and into children's bedrooms; the proposal would be dominant and overbearing and excessively prominent within the street scene; the proposal should be amended to reduce the scale and require obscure glazing, better window placement and natural screening; the proposal did not respect the character of the street scene, particularly with regard to roof form, positioning and style of windows and materials; and the proposal was contrary to the Three Rivers District Council Development Plan and Policy CA2 of the Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan.

In response to the points raised by speakers in relation to privacy and overlooking, the Planning Officer responded that the brick flanks to the dormers would ordinarily be allowed as permitted development. Whilst the works which had been carried out to date were not in accordance with the Certificate of Lawfulness, and the proposal was contrary to the Council's design criteria, officers were of the view that that the rear dormer window, the hip to gable roof and the front rooflights would nonetheless be allowed under the General Permitted Development Order. There had therefore been a need to balance officers' reservations about the harm arising from the proposal against the fallback position of permitted development. The size of the dormer had been reduced since the original submission to match what would be achievable under permitted development. In response to a question, the Planning Officer reported that the element of the proposal which would not be within the scope of permitted development and which required specific permission was the two-storey side extension. Therefore, the Committee would need to consider whether there was any harm arising from the proposal in relation to the extension.

The Planning Officer also commented that the proposal would not push development any closer to residents of Cherry Croft. Whilst the back-to-back distances for some were below the design criteria, this was an existing situation which would not be exacerbated. The views from the first floor rear extension would be no greater; this was shown on the plans to be an ensuite bathroom and as such could be conditioned to required obscured glazing.

A Committee Member questioned whether - given that the dormer window was the main reason for concerns about privacy - any condition might be imposed (such as obscured glazing) to mitigate the impact. The Planning Officer responded that as the dormer window fell within permitted development, the applicant was allowed to use clear glazing in the window, and such a condition would be likely to be considered unreasonable. With regard to

conditioning obscured glazing to the ensuite in the first floor rear extension, the Planning Officer responded that given its use as a bathroom it was quite likely that the applicant would wish to use obscured glazing, or at least half and half. However, given that the window and extension would not go beyond the existing footprint, and was angled slightly to the south west (and not directly opposite other properties) it would likely be considered unreasonable to require obscured glazing by condition.

Several Committee Members expressed concerns about the proposal, considering that it included some elements which could not be considered acceptable, particularly in relation to overlooking. However, it was acknowledged that there was not any justification for refusal in planning terms.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor Smith seconded, that part-retrospective planning permission be granted subject to conditions and amendment to Condition 3 to require tile hanging to be applied to both flanks of the dormer window.

On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 4 in favour, 0 against and 4 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That part-retrospective planning permission be granted subject to conditions and amendment to Condition 3 to require tile hanging to be applied to both flanks of the dormer window.

Councillor Sian re-joined the meeting.

PC143/25 26/0122/FUL – ALTERATIONS TO ELEVATIONS OF EXISTING CAR PARK BUILDING TO ENCLOSE UPPER FLOOR FOR COMMERCIAL USE (CLASS E), INCLUDING BRICKWORK AND WINDOWS; ASSOCIATED WORKS INCLUDING NEW RAMP AND STAIRCASE; AND LANDSCAPING ALTERATIONS AT TRINITY COURT, CHURCH STREET, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 1RT

The application was for alterations to elevations of existing car park building to enclose upper floor for commercial use (Class E), including brickwork and windows; associated works including new ramp and staircase; and landscaping alterations at Trinity Court, Church Street, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that a query had been raised in advance of the committee meeting regarding an earlier permission at the site. Clarification was provided that the wider site was subject to a separate prior approval permission for the conversion of the three-storey office building to 38 residential flats, although this permission had not been implemented. The application now before the committee had been assessed on its own merits and against the existing situation of the three-storey building still being in office use. Officers considered that, should the application be approved, both permissions could in theory be implemented; however, condition one of the prior approval permission would be breached. This condition related to the layout and provision of car parking across the site, as some of the parking provision would be lost through the proposed conversion of the car park to commercial space under this application. To regularise this, the prior approval permission would need to be the subject of a variation of condition application. As stated in the officer report, if the development were proposed to be implemented under the existing circumstances of the three-storey building being retained in office use, this would result in a total over-supply of five car parking spaces across the whole site. The adopted parking standards dictated that the existing office use should provide 83 car parking spaces. If the building were to be converted to residential use, total demand for car parking spaces would be 70. This meant that the demand for parking, if the prior approval permission were implemented, would be less. Officers were therefore of the opinion that if both schemes were implemented, an attempt to regularise condition one would be likely to be subject to objection by the local planning authority.

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

Points raised by the speaker against the application included: the proposal involved a change of use and should be refused; the proposal would result in a building which would be highly dominant and overwhelm the street scene; consideration was needed to the context of the surroundings of the Batchworth Lock corridor; the proposal conflicted with the Batchworth Neighbourhood Plan; there was a diminishing demand for commercial space and a general over-supply in the area so that the proposal would not contribute to the economic development of the locality; and there were concerns about contamination following many years of use by motor vehicles.

In response to the points raised by the speaker against the proposal, the Planning Officer confirmed that most of the issues raised had been addressed in the report. Whilst it was acknowledged that the appearance of the building would be altered from its current form, details of materials were conditioned to be supplied and it was not considered that there would be any resulting harm. The historic use of the car park, and the historic wider use of the site, meant that contamination was possible; for this reason, measures to address contamination prior to works commencing and requirements for ongoing monitoring would be conditioned.

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

- In response to a question, the Planning Officer explained the reasons for the condition which restricted use to Classes E (c), (d), (e) and (g), as set out in paragraph 7.1.8 of the report. Some sub-categories of Use Class E had been excluded on the grounds of not being compatible with, or appropriate for, the site location. Any remaining sub-categories which were not considered to be incompatible were permitted within the condition. In debate, a Committee Member recommended that the sub-categories of Class E which were permitted should be as broad as possible, and that Class E(f) should be added so that the building could also be used as a crèche, day nursery or day centre.
- The Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal included provision for a bin store, and that no changes were proposed with regard to the existing parking arrangements other than the removal of 22 parking spaces on the upper floor level of the car park.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Points raised by the speaker in favour of the application included: the initial plan for the development was to try to get the building fully occupied by commercial tenants, as there were existing clients with tenancies which ran for the next five years. Thereafter, there may be potential to create a larger business centre; the proposal would provide high grade small office space for smaller and medium-size businesses; the development would provide cycle storage and would also improve the current arrangement with regard to bin storage.

Councillor Morris moved, and Councillor Gazzard seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions and amendment to Condition 4 to include reference to Use Class E(f). On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and amendment to Condition 4 to include reference to Use Class E(f).

PC144/25 26/0219/FUL - ERECTION OF ENTRANCE RAMP WITH HANDRAILS, ALTERATION TO FENESTRATION, VENTILATION GRILLS, BIN STORE AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING WORKS AT THREE RIVERS HOUSE, NORTHWAY, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 1RL

The application was for erection of entrance ramp with handrails, alteration to fenestration, ventilation grills, bin store and associated landscaping works at Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that works had commenced in relation to some aspects of the proposed development.

Councillor Khiroya moved, and Councillor Gazzard 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.

PC145/25 26/0373/ADV – ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT: INSTALLATION OF INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED FASCIA SIGN, AND SIGNS MOUNTED ON FRONT/SIDE OF DECKING ENCLOSURE AT 15 MONEY HILL PARADE, UXBRIDGE ROAD,, RICKMANSWORTH WD3 7BE

The application was for advertisement consent for installation of internally illuminated fascia sign, and signs mounted on front/side of decking enclosure at 15 Money Hill Parade, Uxbridge Road, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that an amendment was required to Condition 3, which related to the hours which the illuminated sign was permitted to be turned on. The hours stated in the report were incorrect but would be updated to reflect the opening hours granted on the previous application in 2024, which were 08:00 to 23:30 Monday to Saturday and 10:00 to 22:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor Morris seconded, that advertisement consent be granted subject to conditions and amendment to Condition 3 to alter the permitted opening hours. On being put to the vote this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED:

That advertisement consent be granted subject to conditions and amendment to Condition 3 to alter the permitted opening hours.

CHAIR