

---

## **Planning Committee MINUTES**

**Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on Thursday, 31 July 2025 from 7.30 - 8.52 pm**

**Present:** Councillors Chris Whately-Smith, Elinor Gazzard, Oliver Cooper, Steve Drury, Philip Hearn, Chris Lloyd, Chris Mitchell, Debbie Morris, Andrea Fraser and Sarah Nelmes

**Also in Attendance:**

Parish Councillor Diana Barber (Batchworth Community Council), Parish Councillor Jon Bishop (Chorleywood Parish Council), Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst

**Officers in Attendance:**

Emma Lund, Senior Committee Officer  
Adam Ralton, Development Management Team Leader  
Claire Westwood, Development Management Team Leader

**PC23/25      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Harry Davies, Stephen King and Abbas Merali.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes substituted for Councillor Harry Davies and Councillor Andrea Fraser substituted for Councillor Abbas Merali.

**PC24/25      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Liberal Democrat Group declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 4 (25/0667/FUL: 2 Arundel Road, Abbots Langley) as the agent is a member of the authority and a member of the Liberal Democrat Group.

**PC25/25      25/0666/FUL - CHANGE OF USE FROM CLASS F.2B (LOCAL COMMUNITY HALL OR MEETING PLACE FOR THE PRINCIPAL USE OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY) TO CLASS E (F) (CRECHE, DAY NURSERY OR DAY CENTRE; NOT INCLUDING A RESIDENTIAL USE) AT BULLSLAND HALL, BULLSLAND LANE, CHORLEYWOOD WD3 5BQ**

The application was for change of use from Class F2b (Local community hall or meeting place for the principal use of the local community) to Class E(f) (Creche, day nursery or day centre, not including a residential use) at Bullsland Hall, Bullsland Lane, Chorleywood.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates.

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

- Bullsland Hall currently had a permitted class use which was unrestricted in terms of its use as a community facility. Consequently, a number of committee members considered that the application for change of use would not result in levels of noise or disturbance which would exceed those currently permitted.
- The current permitted use class also did not have any restrictions relating to the use of the outdoor space. However, officers reported that the outdoor space was small, which may present natural restrictions within the current use class. Officers' concerns with regard to the proposed change of use related to an intensification of the use of the outdoor space.
- Officers confirmed that were the proposed change of use to be approved, the Hall could no longer operate as a community facility. However, the applicant had advised that in recent years there had been little to no demand for it in that capacity, and alternative provision had been made for any existing community use. Officers did not object to the loss of the community use.
- A number of committee members considered that the benefit in terms of the provision of much needed childcare places was important and should be given significant weight.
- There were a number of ways in which noise impacts could be mitigated, and additionally, the age range would include babies as well as toddlers. The harm caused to neighbour amenity arising from children playing outdoors during daytime hours was not considered by committee members to be unacceptable.
- No fence was proposed as part of the application and depending on certain factors, including its height relative to the highway, suitable fencing may be able to be provided within permitted development. As a fence did not form part of the application, no condition could be included in relation to it.
- The existing parking provision of 6 spaces was considered by officers to be acceptable.
- Some committee members considered that restrictions on the hours of indoor and outdoor use were neither necessary or appropriate given the use class, and that children should not be restricted in the hours in which they could play outside. Other committee members considered that conditions on hours of use in the event of approval were required in order to mitigate potential noise impacts and safeguard neighbour amenity. The applicant did not object to restrictions on hours of use.
- Following debate members agreed that, in the event of approval, conditions would be needed in relation to the time limit for implementation, confirmation of the approved plans, restriction of use to Class E(f), restriction on the number of children, and restriction on the hours of indoor and outdoor use.

Parish Councillor Jon Bishop, the applicant, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Lloyd moved, and Councillor Morris seconded, approval of the application subject to conditions relating to: the time limit for implementation; confirmation of the approved plans; restriction of use to Class E(f); restriction on the number of children to 18; restriction on the hours of indoor use to 08:00 to 18:30; and restriction on the hours of outdoor use to 10:00 to 18:30.

Councillor Cooper moved, and Councillor Hearn seconded, an amendment to the motion to remove conditions relating to the hours of operation of indoor and outdoor use.

Following debate, the proposer and seconder of the amendment agreed a revision to include restrictions on the hours of indoor use to 07:00 to 19:00 and the hours of outdoor use to 10:00 to 19:00.

On being put to the vote the amended motion was carried, the voting being 9 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:** that the application be approved, subject to conditions relating to the time limit for implementation; confirmation of the approved plans; restriction of use to Class E(f); restriction on the number of children to 18; restriction on the hours of indoor use to 07:00 to 19:00; and restriction on the hours of outdoor use to 10:00 to 19:00.

**PC26/25      25/0667/FUL – FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION AT 2 ARUNDEL ROAD, ABBOTS LANGLEY WD5 0TP**

The application was for a first floor side extension at 2 Arundel Road, Abbots Langley.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there were no updates. As set out in the report, the application followed a previously refused application. The changes between the refused scheme and the current scheme related to removal of the garage and revision of the design of the side rear extension. The size of the first floor front element was unchanged, but given the context of the site and the character of the road as it is now (rather than as it had been at the time of the previous application) it was considered to be acceptable.

Committee members noted that there had been no objections from the Parish Council, and no objections in response to the consultation.

Councillor Lloyd moved, and Councillor Gazzard 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.

**PC27/25      25/0694/RSP – RETROSPECTIVE: CONSTRUCTION OF OUTBUILDING IN REAR GARDEN FOR ANCILLARY RESIDENTIAL USE AT 20 MARLIN SQUARE, ABBOTS LANGLEY WD5 0EG**

The application was retrospective for: construction of outbuilding in rear garden for ancillary residential use at 20 Marlin Square, Abbots Langley, Hertfordshire.

The Planning Officer reported that since agenda publication correspondence had been received expressing concerns about the potential intensification of the use of an existing right of way via a neighbouring property. It was considered that this may cause harm to the amenity of that neighbour. Whilst it had been suggested that a personal planning permission could resolve the concern, officers did not consider that this would be reasonable or appropriate for this application, and this was supported by planning practice guidance. However, officers did consider that it would be reasonable to attach an additional condition requiring that the outbuilding be accessed only from the main dwellinghouse at 20 Marlin Square and not directly accessed via the right of way through number 22. The reason for the condition being to safeguard the amenity of the neighbours from any potential intensification in the use of the right of way.

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst spoke on the application.

The agent spoke in favour of 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:

- The outbuilding was c 10cm taller than would have been allowed under permitted development. A building which had a larger footprint, but which was 10cm lower, would also have been allowable under permitted development, provided it was for incidental use.

However, the use of the outbuilding for independent living, as was currently the case, would not have been allowable under permitted development.

- Any variance of title to the right of way would be a civil matter rather than a planning matter. Any breaches of the proposed planning condition regarding access to the outbuilding could be reported to the Enforcement Team for investigation.
- A committee member recommended that Condition 1 should be amended in order to correctly capture the current use of the building. It was recommended that the condition should refer to the use being '*ancillary to the enjoyment of, or incidental to the residential dwelling....*' and this was accepted by officers.
- An air conditioning unit referred to by a speaker did not form part of the application but could be referred to the Enforcement Team for investigation.

Councillor Morris moved, and Councillor Gazzard seconded, approval of the application subject to conditions, an additional condition restricting access to the outbuilding to be via the main house, and amendment to condition 1 to restrict the use to be ancillary or incidental to the residential dwelling. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 7 in favour, 0 against, 3 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:** that the application be approved subject to conditions, an additional condition restricting access to the outbuilding to be via the main house, and amendment to condition 1 to restrict the use to be ancillary or incidental to the residential dwelling.

**PC28/25      25/0901/ADV – ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT: INSTALLATION OF ONE EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED "MCDONALD'S" LETTERSET, ONE EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED "GOLDEN ARCH" TO FRONT ELEVATION, ONE NON ILLUMINATED SIGN TO REAR ELEVATION, AND 6 NON-ILLUMINATED PARKING SIGNS - AT 94 – 102 HIGH STREET, RICKMANSWORTH WD3 1AQ**

The application was for advertisement consent for installation of one externally illuminated "McDonald's" letterset, one externally illuminated "Golden Arch" to front elevation, one non illuminated sign to rear elevation, and 6 non-illuminated parking signs - at 94 – 102 High Street, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates and presented illustrations of how the proposed scheme differed from that which had previously been consented at the site, highlighting that the key differences were that the new scheme proposed removal of the projecting sign and yellow vinyl 'Golden Arch' applied externally to glazing, to be replaced with a smaller externally illuminated 'Golden Arch' to the front fascia.

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 expressed the view that the previously consented hanging sign had been more in keeping with the character of the High Street Conservation Area. Another committee member considered that the new scheme was more in keeping with the High Street due to the removal of the large vinyl 'Golden Arch' and its replacement with a smaller, more discreet version.
- Officers advised that consent of the new scheme would not preclude the applicant potentially also including elements of the previously approved scheme. However, it was understood that this was not the applicant's intention. Committee members agreed that an informative should be added requesting that only one grant of advertisement consent is implemented.

Parish Councillor Diana Barber spoke on the application.

Councillor Nelmes moved, and Councillor Lloyd seconded, that advertisement consent be granted subject to conditions and the addition of an informative requesting that only one grant of advertisement consent is implemented. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 8 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:** that advertisement consent be granted subject to conditions and the addition of an informative requesting that only one grant of advertisement consent is implemented.

**CHAIR**