THREE RIVERS DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the Full Council held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on Tuesday, 14 July 2026 from 7.30pm to 10pm

Present: Councillors Councillor Keith Martin, Councillor Reena Ranger OBE,

Christopher Alley, Aidan Bentley, Ian Campbell, Anaika Chopra, Oliver Cooper, Stephen Cox, Harry Davies, Steve Drury, Vicky Edwards, Andrea Fraser, Elinor Gazzard, Stephen Giles-Medhurst OBE, Shelley Gormley, Lisa Hudson, Tony Humphreys, Matthew Hunt, Raj Khiroya, Joan King, Chris Lloyd, David Major, Kerry Milliken, Chris Mitchell, Debbie Morris, Krutika Patel, Louise Price, Kevin Raeburn, Paul Rainbow, Ciaran Reed, Andrew Scarth, Narinder Sian, Mike Sims, Tom Smith, Cheryl Stungo, Jon Tankard, Kavan Trivedi and Chris Whately-Smith

Officers in Attendance:

Joanne Wagstaffe – Chief Executive
Kimberley Grout – Associate Director for Corporate, Customer and Community
Jon Boyle – Deputy Monitoring Officer
Lucy Smith – Committee and Electoral Services Manager

136 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Ian Morris.

137 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 19 May 2026 and the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 01 June 2026 were agreed as a correct record.

138 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mike Sims declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to the Removal of the Weir motion as a Committee Member of the Rickmansworth resident's Association and as the owner of a property backing onto the Mill Stream.

139 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair invited the Council to observe a minute's silence in memory of Ann Widdecombe.

The Chair paid tribute to Kimberley Grout, who would shortly be retiring from the authority, and thanked her for her service to the Council and her professional and impartial advice to Members.

On behalf of the Council, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Giles-Medhurst, spoke thanking Kimberley Grout for her sterling, unbiased and excellent service to the Council, especially in her more recent role as the Acting Monitoring Officer. He wished her all the best in her new adventure in sunny Spain.

The Chair advised that Three urgent items had been accepted.

The Council received a presentation from Maria Campanini regarding sepsis awareness and heard details of her family's experience following the death of her sister Gina. Members were encouraged to support awareness raising activities throughout the district and to assist with the Council's work alongside the UK Sepsis Trust.

The Chair also updated Members on the proposed “Three Rivers Voices” project being undertaken in partnership with Three Rivers Museum to capture an oral history of the District in advance of Local Government Reorganisation.

Councillor Ciaran Reed congratulated Councillor Chris Alley and his family on the birth of baby Theodore.

Councillor Joan King and Oliver Cooper also spoke in support of the Chair’s chosen charity, the UK Sepsis Trust.

140 PETITIONS

The Council was advised that no petitions had been received.

141 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Council received the public question submitted by Jon Bishop regarding the proposed amendments to the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan and noted the written response provided by the Leader.

Mr Bishop indicated that he did not wish to ask a supplementary question.

142 APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Councillor Giles-Medhurst moved the recommendations and Councillor Price seconded.

The Leader proposed the additional amendment that Councillor Raeburn replace Councillor Lloyd as a named substitute on the Planning Committee.

Councillor Mitchell proposed that Councillor Sian be appointed as an additional named substitute for the Planning Committee.

Councillor Cooper proposed that Councillor Campbell replace Councillor Edwards as named substituted on the Planning Committee.

All amendments were seconded by Councillor Price.

On being put to the vote, the motion and amendments were declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being by general assent.

RESOLVED:

That the appointments to committees and named substitutes be approved as amended.

143 MINOR AMENDMENTS TO CHORLEYWOOD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Councillor Giles Medhurst moved the recommendations and Councillor Cooper seconded.

The Leader explained that the amendments removed references to Chorleywood as a “Village” and aligned the supporting text of the Plan with the Council’s Settlement Appraisal which categorized Chorleywood as a town. The Leader confirmed that officers had consulted the Planning Inspectorate and were satisfied that the changes constituted minor amendments.

Councillors expressed support for the amendments but a suggestion was made that additional evidence should be prepared to strengthen the Council’s position on the status of Chorleywood in future planning appeals.

Councillors that also sat on the parish Council were advised to refrain from voting due to their connection to Chorleywood Parish Council.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being by general assent

RESOLVED:

That Council agrees the minor amendments and adopts the update Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan in Appendix 2.

144 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW MILL END, MAPLE CROSS, WEST HYDE

Councillor Giles-Medhurst moved the recommendations and Councillor Price seconded.

The Leader introduced the report and advised that the Community Governance Review had reached the end of its consultation stage. It was explained that the consultation responses received from residents had not demonstrated a clear level of support either for or against the creation of parish councils and that the responses received were insufficient to justify progressing the draft recommendations. Members were informed that in legal terms, the existing review would need to be concluded before a further district wide review could be commenced. It was also noted that forthcoming Local Government Reorganization would provide residents with further information about future governance arrangements and that any future review could therefore be undertaken on amore informed basis.

During debate, Members expressed concern that the consultation responses had not previously been made available for wider scrutiny and suggested that all Members should have sight of the representations received before a decision was reached. It was argued that Members were being asked to determine the outcome of the review without having had the opportunity to examine the evidence on which the recommendation had been based. Concerns were also raised regarding statutory timescales and whether the review should concluded earlier.

In response, the mover advised that the consultation responses would be circulated to Members. It was explained that recommendation before Council was not intended to prevent future consideration of parish governance arrangements but instead to allow a broader district wide review to proceed in a manner that reflected future local government structures.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 23 votes For, 0 votes Against and 15 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That the current Community Governance Review commenced following the decision of the Policy and Resources Committee on 17 November 2025 be discontinued.

That no further work be undertaken in relation to draft or final proposals arising from the current review.

That officers be requested to develop proposals and terms of reference for a future district wide Community Governance Review covering all parish and unparished areas of the district for consideration by Members at a future meeting.

145 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Councillor Giles-Medhurst moved the recommendations and Councillor price seconded. The Leader advised that the proposed review would consider a range of governance matters across the district, including parish boundaries, governance arrangements within existing parish councils, requests relating to unparished areas and potential alterations to current parish structures. It was explained that the review would also encompass matters raised by parish councils and residents since the completion of previous reviews.

Members welcomed the opportunity to undertake a comprehensive district wide review but raised a number of concerns regarding the proposed terms of reference. It was suggested that any boundary changes should reflect the wishes of local residents and should not be imposed where there was significant local opposition. Members also proposed that consultation questions should be agreed in advance with Group Leaders and that consultation responses should be made available for scrutiny throughout the process. Concerns were also expressed about previous consultation exercises and the need to ensure clear and meaningful engagement with residents and parish councils.

Members discussed potential future parish boundary changes between Croxley Green and Sarratt and whether reviews should consider existing physical settlement patterns or future development proposals. It was argued that boundaries should reflect established communities and current circumstances rather than anticipated future development. Other Members felt that discussions between local ward councillors and parish councils could assist officers in determining the most appropriate arrangements.

Advice was provided that the review needed to commence within a defined timescale if it was to conclude before Local Government Reorganisation milestones. It was therefore considered impractical to delay commencement pending further committee consideration. Members subsequently agreed that authority should be delegated to officers to make minor amendments to the Terms of Reference following consultation with Group Leaders.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 24 votes For and 14 Absentions.

RESOLVED:

That Council proceed with a Community Governance Review as set out in the terms of reference.

Should Full Council agree to undertake a Community Governance Review to agree to the terms of reference attached to Appendix A.

146 RIGHT TO BUY CAPITAL RECEIPT

Councillor Price moved the recommendations and Councillor Giles-Medhurst seconded. The deputy leader introduced the report and explained that the proposal sought to safeguard future Right to Buy Capital Receipts so that they could continue to support the delivery of housing within Three Rivers area following Local Government Reorganisation. Members were informed that the proposed arrangements would involve future receipts being transferred into Three Rivers Homes Limited, with the Council receiving an equivalent non-voting equity interest in the company. The Deputy Leader stated that the purpose of the proposal was to ensure that funding generated within the district continued to benefit local housing provision.

During debate, Members questioned whether the proposed arrangements represented the most effective use of the receipts and raised concerns regarding the Council’s future influence within the company. Questions were asked regarding the value of the non-voting shares, the level of control retained by the Council and whether future successor authorities could alter the arrangements. Some Members considered that the matter would benefit from further scrutiny at Policy and Resources Committee and argued that additional information regarding alternative options should have been provided.

Other Members emphasized the importance of retaining investment within the district and expressed concern that, without the proposed deed of variation, future receipts could be spent elsewhere within any successor authority area. Debate also included discussion on the wider principle of the Right to Buy scheme, the future provision of affordable housing and the need to maximize investment within the local area.

Officers clarified that the shares proposed would be non-voting equity interests and that the purpose of the arrangement was to protect the Council's financial interest whilst maintaining the existing governance arrangements within Three Rivers Homes. Members were advised that, if the proposals were not approved, there would be no mechanism for ensuring that future receipts remained dedicated to housing provision within the district.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being, 23 votes For, 14 votes Against, and 1 Absentention.

RESOLVED:

That Full Council give delegated authority to the Director of Finance in consultation with the Deputy Leader (as Lead Member for Resources) to enter into a Deed of Variation to the original stock transfer agreement:
a) To transfer future RTB receipts, originally paid to Three Rivers District Council directly into Three Rivers Homes Limited.
b) To require these receipts to be used for the provision of housing within the area covered by Three Rivers District Council.
c) That the council receive an equivalent, non-voting, equity stake in Three Rivers Homes.
d) To make any associated changes to Three Rivers Homes Articles of Association or shareholder arrangements to put the deed of variation into effect.

147 POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

147a BUDGET OUTTURN REPORT 2025/26

Councillor Price moved the recommendations and Councillor Giles-Medhurst seconded. The Deputy Leader introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the Council's revenue and capital outturn position. Tribute was paid to the Director of Finance and her team for their work in managing the Council's finances during a challenging period and for achieving a positive overall outturn position.

During debate, Members welcomed the overall financial performance of the authority but sought further information regarding a number of areas within the budget. Particular reference was made to expenditure associated with waste management services and the desire for a more detailed breakdown of costs in future reports. Whilst Members accepted that some matters would require a written response outside the meeting, there was general support for the recommendations and recognition that the report demonstrated prudent financial management during the year.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 24 votes For, 14 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That Council approves the following:

- That the revenue year end variance after carry forwards of £0.461m be noted.
- That the capital year end position as summarised in paragraph 3.12 and Appendix 3 be noted.
- To approve to carry forward the unspent service budgets from 2025/26 to 2026/27 which total £0.580m to enable completion of projects as detailed at Appendix 2.
- To approve the rephasing of capital projects from 2025/26 to 2026/27 as detailed at Appendix 4.

147b CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2027-2028

Councillor Giles-Medhurst moved the recommendation and Councillor Price seconded. The Leader advised Members that the proposed timetable had been developed to support effective decision making throughout the municipal year and highlighted one date which officers were reviewing in response to concerns raised regarding the timing of a Policy and Resources Committee meeting. It was noted that the scheduled date coincided with the party conference season and created a particularly short turnaround between the committee meeting and publication of the subsequent Full Council agenda.

Members welcomed the review of the Policy and Resources committee change from 04 October to 08 October 2026.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being by general assent.

RESOLVED:

That Council adopts the committee timetable for the 2027 to 2028 municipal year.

147c CIL SPENDING APPLICATIONS – JANUARY 2026 APPLICATIONS

Councillor Giles-Medhurst moved the recommendations and Councillor Lloyd seconded. The Council considered proposals relating to Community Infrastructure Levy funding applications, including projects at Chorleywood Common Youth Football Club, Croxley Guild Bowls Club and One YMCA Woodlands Community Hub. The Leader acknowledged concerns previously raised during Policy and Resources Committee regarding aspects of the supporting paperwork and advised that improvements would be made to the process for future funding rounds.

During debate, Members expressed support for the projects before Council and recognized the benefits they would bring to residents through improved sporting, leisure and community facilities. However, concerns were raised regarding applications that had not been recommended for funding. Members emphasized the importance of ensuring that unsuccessful applicants received appropriate advice and support to enable them to develop stronger bids and reapply during future funding rounds. The Council was advised that officers were already working with unsuccessful applicants to help strengthen future submissions.

Members welcomed the significant investment in local infrastructure and noted the positive impact that the approved schemes would have on participation in sport, recreation and community activities across the district.

On being put to the vote the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being by general assent.

RESOLVED:

- That Members approve CIL funding for the following schemes detailed in Table 1 of this report and summarised in the table below for 2026/2027:

Applicant & Project Name	**Infrastructure**	**CIL Amount**
Croxley Guild Bowls Club, Croxley Guild of Sport, The Green, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth. WD3 3HT	Improvements to Clubhouse and access to Bowling Green and provision of a shelter	£47,298

Chorleywood Common Youth Football Club (CCYFC) Lady Ela Drive, Chorleywood, WD3 5SL	Refurbishment of Current Pavilion	£363,000
One YMCA Woodlands Community Hub in Leavesden Country Park College Road Abbots Langley Hertfordshire WD5 0GU	MUGA and 3G Pitch Refurbishment	£47,050

- The final funding and implementation of the 3 agreed projects is delegated to the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Lead Members for Resources and Planning Policy and Infrastructure, to determine to enable the agreed projects to be progressed and implemented.

147d PRIMATE LICENSING

Councillor Rainbow moved the recommendations and Councillor Drury seconded. The Lead Member introduced the report and explained the Council's new responsibilities arising from the introduction of national regulations relating to the keeping of primates. Members were advised that the regulations required local authorities to establish a licensing framework, undertake inspections and ensure compliance with nationally prescribed welfare standards.

The Council noted that the proposed fee structure had been designed to recover the costs associated with administering the scheme and that approval was required to enable the Council to discharge its statutory responsibilities. Members welcomed the report and agreed that the Council should implement the necessary arrangements in accordance with the regulations.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being by general assent.

RESOLVED:

That Members note the introduction of the Regulations and the Council's duties as the licensing authority.

Approve the adoption of a primate licensing scheme in accordance with the regulations.

Approve the proposed fee structure set out in 3.7 of this report, which will then form part of the annual fees and charges.

148 COUNCIL PLAN DELIVERY PLAN

Councillor Giles-Medhurst moved the recommendations and Councillor Price seconded. The Leader introduced the Delivery plan and explained that it provided the framework for delivering the Council Plan over the period 2026 to 2029. Members were advised that the document represented a high level programme of work and would be supported by ongoing monitoring and performance reporting.

During debate, an amendment was proposed seeking to strengthen arrangements for Member oversight and monitoring of delivery against the Plan. Members generally supported the principles behind the amendment, but concerns were raised about the manner and timing in which it had been circulated. It was argued that all political groups should be afforded sufficient opportunity to consider amendments before a meeting and that maintaining a level playing field was an important constitutional principle. The Chair also expressed concern regarding the late submission of substantial amendments and the limited opportunity available for Members to review them in detail before debate commenced.

Following discussion, Members acknowledged the value of enhanced scrutiny arrangements and indicated broad support for the underlying intention of the amendment. It was suggested that the matter could be developed further through discussions between officers and Group Leaders. In light of the comments made, the amendment was withdrawn. Members then returned to consideration of the substantive recommendations within the report.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 19 votes For, and 19 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That Council review and agree the adoption of the Council Plan 2026 -2029 Delivery Plan.

Council agree the Delivery plan will be presented to the Policy and Resources Committee every 6 months.

149 APPEALS UNDER 6.4 OF PART 4 ACCESS TO INFORMATION PROCEDURE RULES

Councillor Giles-Medhurst moved that the appeal be rejected and Councillor Price seconded. The Leader advised that the matter related solely to an appeal against the withholding of legal advice and that Council was not being asked to determine the underlying planning matter which formed the background to the request. Members were reminded that the report before Council concerned the interpretation of the Council's constitutional provisions relating to access to information.

In opening the debate, Members supporting the appeal argued that access to the legal advice was necessary to allow proper scrutiny of decisions and to enable Members to fulfil their democratic responsibilities. It was suggested that legal privilege was not an automatic bar to disclosure and that Council was required to weigh the public interest arguments in favour of releasing the information. Members contended that disclosure would improve transparency and accountability, particularly where planning enforcement decisions had attracted public concern. It was argued that there was a strong public interest in understanding the legal basis for significant decisions taken on behalf of the authority.

Other Members opposed the appeal and argued that the Council should place reliance on the professional advice of its statutory officers. It was emphasized that the matter under consideration concerned the constitutional process for handling information requests rather than the merits of the planning case itself. Members expressed concern that overturing the decision would undermine established governance arrangements and the professional judgement exercised by officers in relation to legally privileged advice. It was further argued that no substantive evidence had been produced demonstrating that the original decision to withhold the advice had been flawed.

During the debate, Officers provided clarification regarding the scope of the appeal. Members were advised that the Council was not being asked to reconsider the underlying planning issues and that the appeal was confined to the question of whether the legal advice should be disclosed. Officers explained that the original decision had been taken under delegated authority and that Members had not been required to determine the matter. It was also explained that a summary of the relevant legal advice had previously been provided and that the report set out the principal reasons why privilege had been maintained.

A number of procedural points were raised during the discussion, and the meeting was briefly suspended before resuming shortly afterwards. Following further debate, the mover reiterated that the professional judgement of officers should be supported and that Council should uphold the constitutional arrangements governing access to information requests.

A recorded vote was requested by Councillor Cooper and supported by Councillors Reed, Edwards, Fraser, Trivedi and D Morris.

On being put to the vote, the motion as declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being:

For: Councillors Bentley, Cox, Davies, Drury, Gazzard, Giles-Medhurst, Gormley, Humphreys, Khiroya, King, Lloyd, Major, Martin, Mitchell, Price, Raeburn, Rainbow, Scarth, Sian, Smith, Stungo, Tankard and Whatley-Smith (23)

Against: Councillors Alley, Campbell, Chopra, Cooper, Edwards, Fraser, Hudson, Hunt, Milliken, D Morris, Patel, Raner, Reed and Trivedi (14)

Abstentions: Councillor Sims (1)

RESOLVED:

That Council notes the representations from Councillor Cooper and this report by the Chief Executive.

That the legal advice not be made public.

150 APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM MONITORING OFFICER

The Chair agreed to take this urgent item following item 6 under Rule 6(2) of the Constitution.

Councillor Giles-Medhurst moved the recommendation and Councillor Price seconded.

The Leader explained that, following the retirement of the current interim Monitoring Officer, Kimberley Grout, it was necessary to appoint an Interim Monitoring Officer pending recruitment to the permanent post.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being by general assent.

RESOLVED:

That Jonathan Boyle be appointed Interim Monitoring Officer from 01 September 2026 until further notice.

151 LEAD MEMBER REPORTS

The Council received the written Lead Member reports and noted the updates provided on activities since the previous meeting of Full Council.

The Leader of the Council introduced his report and highlighted a number of matters relating to planning, local government reform and ongoing strategic projects across the district. Members were advised that the Council continued to face significant challenges arising from national planning reforms and interventions affecting the emerging Local Plan. Reference was made to planning appeals, development pressures and the need to continue representing the interest of Three Rivers residents throughout the planning process. Members noted the importance of maintaining a strong local voice as discussions surrounding future local government structures progressed.

The Lead Member for Sustainability and Climate Change updated Members on the Environmental Champions Awards and congratulated those residents, businesses and organizations who had been recognized for their contributions towards sustainability and environmental improvement. Members were also advised that provisional carbon emissions figures indicated that the Council remained below its forecast target levels and continued to make progress against its climate change objectives. The Lead Member paid tribute to officers and community groups who had supported environmental initiatives throughout the district.

In discussing the reports, Members welcomed the information provided and recognized the considerable volume of work being undertaken across the authority. Particular reference was made to planning matters, environmental initiatives, community engagement projects and work associated with local government reorganization. Members acknowledged that a number of significant projects would continue to require careful monitoring over the coming months.

The reports were noted.

Each political party had been able to ask 2 supplementary questions to the Lead Members either from their report or from their portfolio area.

Councillor Edwards to the Lead Member for Sustainability and Climate Change Councillor Bentley asked a question regarding the Council's position on a proposed data centre development affecting Abbots Langley. Members expressed concern about the potential environmental impacts of the proposal and questioned whether support for associated infrastructure improvements could be interpreted as support for the development itself. In response, the Lead Member reiterated opposition to the development proposal and advised that previous representations against the scheme had been made. Members were informed that whilst the Council remained opposed to the development, it would continue to seeks the best possible outcomes for residents should the proposal ultimately proceed through decisions taken at a national level.

Councillor Sian to the Leader of the Council Councillor Giles-Medhurst asked a question regarding the future management of asbestos within the Aquadrome and south assurances about the temporary nature of fencing and restricted access arrangements. Questions focused on whether sections of the Aquadrome might be permanently closed and how future management decisions would be communicated to the public. In response, it was confirmed that the Council would continue to follow the established asbestos management plan and that ongoing assessment of risks would determine future actions. While Members were advised that it was not possible at that stage to provide definitive assurances regarding long term arrangements, a written responses would be provided setting out the Council's position in greater detail.

Councillor Sims to the Lead Member for Leisure, Councillor Lloyd. Concern was raised for the Council's approach to communications with residents during significant projects. Reference was made to the reopening of Ebury Play Area and the positive feedback received regarding public communications during that project. Members suggested that a similar approach should be adopted for other sensitive schemes, particularly where temporary closures or restrictions affected public access. The Lead Member agreed that effective communication was important and advised that officers would continue to provide information where legally and practically possible, whilst recognizing that some matters could not be publicly disclosed during ongoing investigations or legal processes.

Councillor Cox to the Leader of the Council Councillor Giles-Medhurst asked a question regarding the progress of Green Lane Pavilion and the timescales associated with future use of the site. It was recognized that the matter remained important to local residents and sports organisations. The Leader advised that a written response would be provided.

Councillor Cooper to the Lead Member of Resources, Regeneration and Economic Development, Councillor Price asked a question regarding planning enforcement and the destruction of a listed building known as The Court. Members sought clarification regarding potential enforcement action and referred examples elsewhere in the country where local authorities had pursued restoration or reconstruction of heritage assets following unauthorized demolition. In response, the Deputy Leader advised that investigations by the Police and Fire

Service had concluded that responsibility for the incident could not be attributed to a known individual and, as a result, the Council presently had no clear legal basis upon which to pursue certain forms of enforcement action. Members were informed that the Council remained committed to protecting heritage assets and would continue to examine any lawful options available to it. It was also emphasized that each enforcement case depended on its own facts and legal circumstances.

Councillor Mitchell to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Giles-Medhurst regarding the proposed development at Barton Way, Croxley Green and asked whether further discussions could take place with parish councillors and residents regarding potential solutions. It was argued that local representatives should continue to be involved in identifying a mutually acceptable way forward. In response, the Leader confirmed a willingness to meet with interested parties and continue discussions regarding the matter.

Councillor Cox to the Lead Member of Resources, Regeneration and Economic Development, Louise Price, Concerning the timescale for works for Prestwick Road. It was noted that it was not the councils responsibility to solicit leaseholders.

Councillor Sims to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Giles-Medhurst regarding the Mill Stream Motion, Removal of the Weir, it was confirmed that the matter would be further considered at Climate Change and Leisure Committee.

152 QUESTIONS TO THE LEADER AND LEAD MEMBERS

This item was not reached.

153 URGENT QUESTIONS

Question from Cllr Vicky Edwards to the Leader of the Council Cllr Giles-Medhurst

On Friday 10 July 2026 councillors were notified via the weekly register of planning applications that an application had been validated for change of use of land for use as a residential caravan site comprising 2no. Gypsy/Traveller pitches on land South of Harthall Lane, Kings Langley. The neighbour consultation expiry date for making representations in respect of this application is 27 July 2026. However, residents are often very nervous to submit representations in response to applications relating to provision of gypsy/traveller accommodation due to their fears of being identified as someone opposing the application. This nervousness is demonstrated by the planning application to be considered by the planning committee this Thursday, to allow two static caravans per pitch on five of the pitches at the nearby Little Lily gypsy/traveller site. Only one objection has been submitted in respect of the proposal, but I was subsequently told by multiple residents that they wanted to submit objection representations but did not due to fears that their address would be disclosed alongside the comment. Many other councils do not publish the addresses of individual members of the public who make representations on the publicly accessible planning portals. For example, this has been the policy of Dacorum Borough Council for many years, in particular to ensure compliance with data protection legislation. Councils are legally required to collect one's name and address when making a comment, so they know the comment comes from a real, identifiable person; however, these details can be redacted from public viewing. Accordingly, to alleviate such concerns in respect of the application for a new gypsy site off Harthall Lane, can Three Rivers please urgently re-consider its policy of publishing addresses on the planning portal?

A response has been provided by Officers.

It is acknowledged the relevant requirements of publicising planning applications do not require the address of those making representations to be published. However, many Local Authorities, including others in Hertfordshire, continue to publish name and addresses, in compliance with relevant privacy legislation, as it ensures transparency in the planning process. Notwithstanding this, Officers will investigate whether the removal of all or part of the address is possible with the systems we utilise and seek some further information.

154 MOTIONS

This item was not reached.

CHAIRMAN