

---

## **Planning Committee MINUTES**

**Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on  
Thursday, 12 September 2024 from 7.04 pm - 10.00 pm.**

**Present:**

Councillors

Chris Whately-Smith, Chair  
Elinor Gazzard, Vice Chair  
Harry Davies  
Chris Lloyd  
Chris Mitchell  
Philip Hearn  
Abbas Merali  
Debbie Morris  
Narinder Sian  
Sara Bedford  
Ciaran Reed  
Cheryl Stungo

**Officers in Attendance:**

Adam Ralton, Development Management Team Leader  
Lauren Edwards, Senior Planning Officer  
Claire Wilson, Principal Planning Officer  
Anita Hibbs, Committee Officer

**PC53/23      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andrea Fraser, Christopher Alley and Steve Drury, substitute being Councillor Sarah Nelmes.

**PC54/23      MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 15 August 2024 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair of the meeting.

**PC55/23      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Harry Davies declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 12 and 13 in view of his publicly stated comments on applications PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0476/OUT and PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0538/OUT.

Councillor Philip Hearn declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 12 and 13 in view of his publicly stated comments on applications PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0476/OUT and PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0538/OUT.

Councillor Chris Mitchell declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 in view of his publicly stated comments on application 24/0518/FUL.

The Liberal Democrat Group declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 7 and 11, as the architect is a member of the authority and a member of the Liberal Democrat Group.

**PC56/23 NOTICE OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of other business.

**PC57/23 23/1795/FUL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND ERECTION OF 6 NO. TWO STOREY DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED BIN STORE, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WORKS AT 35 HIGH STREET, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WD5 0AA**

The Planning Officer introduced the application and confirmed the changes made to the plans which were all set out in the officer report.

Members of the Committee agreed that all previously raised issues have been adequately addressed and indicated readiness to move forward with the recommendation.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Whately-Smith, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions set out in the report.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 9 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to conditions as set out in the report.

**PC58/23 24/0518/FUL - CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO HORTICULTURE, GRAZING OF ALPACAS AND FOR THE KEEPING OF HORSES INCLUDING ERECTION OF SINGLE POTTING ENCLOSURE, POLY TUNNELS, HAY STORE AND FOUR MOBILE STABLES AT LAND REAR OF CROXLEY HOUSE, LITTLE GREEN LANE, CROXLEY GREEN, HERTS**

Councillor Chris Mitchell left the room at 7.11pm.

The Planning Officer provided the following update:

It is noted that there are two structures currently on site, a timber structure, and a disused portacabin. The applicant has confirmed that these would be removed from site. However, officers consider that it would be reasonable to add one further condition requiring the structures to be removed prior to commencement of the development.

The height of the stables referred to in paragraph 3.6 as 4.8m, should be amended to read 4m.

A further comment has been received from Croxley Parish Council in respect of the re-consultation as follows:

The Parish Council maintains their concerns over creeping development within the Green Belt. The Parish Council wishes to draw attention to the condition of the wall around the site and ask that it be rebuilt wherever necessary immediately and maintained in perpetuity as a condition of granting of any planning permission.

In response, the red line on the plan does not appear to extend to the extent of the boundary which the wall is located on. Therefore, the wall is outside of the application site. Notwithstanding this, it would be unreasonable to require this via a condition, as the wall is not related to the development and therefore it would not be considered necessary or reasonable to add a condition in this regard.

Little Green Residents Association comment is not outlined in full in the report, the comments have been addressed, however, in short, they do raise concerns about what is being grown in the polytunnels, drainage impacts, and the impact of people stopping to look at the Alpacas.

One additional neighbour comment has been received:

In summary, this sets out that new buildings are inappropriate in the green belt, exceptions to this include buildings for agriculture and forestry which would not have a greater impact on openness than existing development. The proposed development would not meet this exception for a number of reasons including that the wall which limits views into the site is not 'existing development' and that the new structures would be prominent. As such very special circumstances would be required which have not been presented.

In response and as set out in 7.2.5 of the officer's report, Paragraph 154 of the NPPF does not stipulate that buildings needed for forestry/agriculture should preserve openness of the Green Belt. It does not require local planning authorities to consider where they would result in greater harm than existing development. The report sets out why the development meets the relevant exceptions and is therefore acceptable within the Green Belt. Officers do not consider that very special circumstances are required.

Mr. Lloyd, the agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Members raised concerns about the potential future repurposing of the buildings for residential or business use, inquiring about conditions that could prevent such changes.

The officer clarified that planning permission would be required for any change of use and outlines existing conditions related to the stable and polytunnel usage. There are a number of conditions already attached, such as condition five (C5), that the stable building shall be used solely for the keeping of four horses, should not be used for commercial purposes. Likewise, the polytunnels can only be used for agricultural purposes and would need to be removed, should that use cease. Therefore, if the applicant wishes, or someone else bought the site in the future and wish to change the use of building, planning permission would be required.

Members also expressed concerns about the condition of the boundary wall, access to the site, and the need for wheel washing facilities during the construction phase.

The officer advised that Hertfordshire Highways, during the course of the application, required further information to be submitted regarding the access. The applicant did submit further information. Hertfordshire Highways raised no objection, and although they are aware of the Killingdown farm site, which is in close proximity, they don't feel that in terms of traffic movements associated with this development, would increase and cause a highway safety impact.

It is the officers' understanding that the boundary wall is unregistered at this point, and officers don't feel that it would be reasonable to tie the boundary wall repair works to this application as it is not related to the keeping of alpacas or the agricultural uses that are proposed. Some of those uses that are proposed on sites, including the alpacas and the polytunnels could be done without needing planning permission.

Members suggested the possibility of adding the same wording to condition five (C5) that is there for the polytunnels in condition six (C6), meaning the removal of the stables after 12

concurrent calendar months, should the use be no longer required. The officer advised that if Members wanted to change the wording of the condition to relate to the other structures, then the conditions could be amended.

Officers reiterated that they have a further plan, which indicates the turning head, highways were reconsulted, and raised no objection to the development.

In response to a request from Members regarding the distance of the gates of the site, the officer advised that they're set back approximately 13 to 14 meters from the edge of the highway, so there would be sufficient space for vehicles to enter and exit the site. Officers further advised that the current conditions don't include a construction management plan, and with regard to wheel washing as a condition, officers were of the opinion that the development would not require that in terms of its scale, but should Members feel it is necessary, then officers can add that as a condition. Members agreed that it would be important and beneficial to the local residents in that area to have the wheel washing facility throughout the construction period added as a condition. Officers also confirmed that they felt it was a reasonable request to add the wheel washing facility on site, given that the lane is narrow, and it is not known at present what time of the year the construction would take place.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes moved, seconded by Councillor Abbas Merali, that subject to no new material considerations being raised, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and the additional conditions requiring:

- existing structures to be removed.
- wheel washing facilities to be provided during construction.
- a timescale within which the stables could be removed following a period of non-use.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 7 For, 0 Against, 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That subject to no new material considerations being raised, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and the additional conditions requiring:

- existing structures to be removed.
- wheel washing facilities to be provided during construction.
- a timescale within which the stables could be removed following a period of non-use.

**PC59/23      24/0918/FUL – CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS, CONVERSION OF GARAGE INTO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SHED AT 19 ASH CLOSE, ABBOTS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD5 0DN**

Councillor Chris Mitchell returned to the room at 7.30pm.

The Planning Officer advised that there was no update.

Members raised concerns about the absence of a condition for tree replacement in a planning application, emphasising the Council's previous motion that mandates replacing every removed tree. Despite the landscape officer's recommendation for replanting, council officers argue that the trees were not protected and could have been removed regardless of the application. The discussion continued with several councillors supporting the idea of imposing a condition for tree replanting, highlighting the importance of maintaining vegetation in the area. A proposal is made to submit a tree planting scheme for approval, ensuring that the replanting aligns with council policies on vegetation.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd, that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions, and additional condition requiring soft landscaping scheme for additional trees to be planted.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 9 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions, and an additional condition requiring soft landscaping scheme for additional trees to be planted.

**PC60/23      24/1018/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF LOWER GROUND FLOOR LEVEL, AND PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FIRST FLOOR FRONT EXTENSION; CONVERSION OF GARAGE INTO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION; LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING SIDE/REAR ROOFLIGHTS INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION DETAIL AT 44 RUSSELL ROAD, MOOR PARK, NORTHWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE, HA6 2LR**

The Planning Officer advised there was no update.

A Parish Councillor spoke against the item.

Mr. Turner also spoke against the item.

Mr. Gupta spoke in support of the application.

Members raised three main points: the reasonableness of a landscaping condition, the lack of responses from consulted neighbours, and discrepancies in site coverage opinions. The officer responded by confirming in their view a landscaping condition is not considered reasonable as no changes to the frontage are proposed, the officer acknowledges that no objections from neighbours have been received, and provided clarification on how the 21% plot coverage was calculated, which exceeds the 15% guideline but is deemed acceptable for maintaining the conservation area's openness. The officer also clarified that she has included the lightwells within the 21% as they would effectively serve the basement, because they are part of that built form.

In response to a further question; the officer stated that she would not know what the figure would be if the lightwells were not included, as it would require a calculation, but on the basis of a worst case scenario, in respect to the 21% including them, the officer felt it was safer to acknowledge that in her view, albeit that there is an exceedance, she still found the development to be acceptable in that regard.

Members emphasised the importance of preserving pre-1958 dwellings in Moor Park, highlighting their special status and historical significance. They referred to a proposed rear elevation drawing and expresses concerns about its alterations, suggesting it does not adequately preserve the building's original character. They referred to the statement from Mr. Turner regarding potential harm to the conservation area and stress that the building itself warrants protection beyond just the conservation context. Additionally, Members critiqued the justification for the proposed percentage increase in alterations, finding it unsatisfactory, and invited further input from committee members.

Members expressed agreement with the concerns raised by the Parish Councillor and Mr. Turner regarding a specific conservation appraisal. They argued that the proposed changes represent a significant deviation from the established conservation guidelines. They highlighted the disproportionate elevation of the proposal, which they believe undermines the intended character preservation outlined in the appraisal. Additionally, Members also raised

concerns about inconsistencies in the application of conservation appraisals across different areas, suggesting a need for a more uniform approach to ensure fairness in decision-making.

The Chair reminded the committee that they should look at each individual item on its merits rather than across the board. Officer confirmed this.

Members raised further concerns about whether the proposed changes will preserve or enhance the area's character. They acknowledged the applicant's efforts in presenting a visually appealing design but remained sceptical about the impact of specific elements, particularly the lightwells. Members highlighted that even though certain features may not be visible from public spaces, they still hold significance in maintaining the conservation area's integrity. The potential for light pollution from the proposed lightwells raises additional concerns, as it could affect neighbouring properties.

Members of the Committee highlighted the previous permitted developments that led to an unbalanced appearance of the building and argued that the new rear extension could restore balance and enhance the overall character. However, some Members disagreed, emphasising that the design features excessive glass, and misinterpreted the function of the lightwells. Members referenced a conservation officer's report in response, expressing concerns about the scale and design of the proposed extensions, stating that they appear bulky and do not align with traditional aesthetics.

Councillor Debbie Morris proposed refusal of the application, citing insufficient amendments to address prior concerns.

The officer stated that the effect of Members' concerns are that by reason of the scale, siting and design of the proposed rear extensions fail to preserve or enhance the character of the existing pre 1958 dwelling, which makes a positive contribution to the conservation area, therefore resulting in less substantial harm to the designated heritage asset, in this case being the conservation area, and that there are no public benefits to outweigh the identified harm.

Members further added that there were concerns regarding the potential impact on the conservation area due to proposed changes in plot coverage. Officers suggested including specific wording that highlights the loss of openness across the site, which could detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area. The specific wording will be circulated to Members of the Committee.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved, seconded by Councillor Abbas Merali, that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 6 For, 0 Against, 3 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. The full agreed wording being as follows:

*The proposed rear extensions, by virtue of their design, siting and scale, would detract from the character of the existing pre-1958 dwelling which positively contributes to the Moor Park Conservation Area. The proposed extensions would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the house and would result in a loss of openness across the site. The resultant impact would diminish the positive contribution currently offered by the dwelling and therefore would as a direct result harm the character and appearance of the Moor Park Conservation Area. The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm*

*under paragraph 208 of the NPPF, however, no public benefits have been demonstrated to outweigh the harm. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policies DM1, DM3 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013), the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2006) and NPPF (2023).*

**PC61/23 24/1093/PIP – PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE APPLICATION: ERECTION OF A BLOCK OF SIX APARTMENTS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, BIN AND BIKE STORE, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WORKS AT LAND ADJACENT TO 62-84 AND 99-121, SYCAMORE ROAD, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTS**

The Planning Officer provided an update to the published report.

One further neighbour objection had been received, but it does not raise any new material planning considerations which have not been covered in the published report.

Mr. Bennett spoke against the application.

Ms. Stulik spoke against the application.

Members recalled a previous refusal from 1993, asserting that conditions have not changed significantly. The officer confirmed that the reasons for refusal are robust and aligned with the inspector's report and explained that the loss of parking wouldn't be considered at this stage. It would be considered at the second stage. Members supported the refusal, citing historical usage of the land since 1962 and reinforcing the argument against development in the area.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Mitchell, that PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE IS REFUSED.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 9 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE IS REFUSED.

The Chair declared a short break and the meeting adjourned at 8.19pm.

The Committee reconvened at 8.23pm.

**PC62/23 24/1101/FUL CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, CONVERSION OF GARAGE INTO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION AND ALTERATIONS TO FRONTAGE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PARKING, AT ALDERS, 64 GROVE FARM PARK, NORTHWOOD, HA6 2BQ**

The Planning Officer advised that amended plans had been received to remove the front rooflights and conditions 2 and 4 require amending to reflect the updated drawing numbers. One letter of support had been received.

A Batchworth Community Councillor spoke against the item.

Mr. Patel spoke in support of the item.

Members raised concerns about the extent of hard standing in front of the property and the loss of a tree. They inquired about the officers' comfort level with the proposed hard standing area and suggested the possibility of including a landscaping condition to enhance soft landscaping. The officer responded by explaining that the officer report deemed the increase in hard standing acceptable, with a 40-60% split favouring soft landscaping. They noted that

neighbouring properties exhibited a range of hard standing levels and that a landscaping condition was not initially recommended. However, they acknowledged the Members' concerns and suggested that feedback on landscaping preferences could guide the homeowner in submitting details for the project.

Members further addressed the removal of a tree and the confusion surrounding its disappearance, suggesting that the area should maintain an open green frontage rather than dense shrubbery and that planting should be provided to mitigate the previous tree removal. The officer explained the historical presence of shrubs and emphasised the need for soft landscaping, urging Members to provide guidance on where such landscaping should be placed. Members expressed agreement with the need for soft landscaping while cautioning against overly tall hedges that could alter the character of the estate. Members also voiced their worries about tandem parking, questioning how vehicles would manoeuvre but agreed that the parking arrangements meet the requirements.

Councillor Abbas Merali moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd, that planning permission be granted, with amendments to C2 and C4 to reflect updated drawings and additional soft landscaping condition.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 9 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted, with amendments to C2 and C4 to reflect updated drawings and additional soft landscaping planting condition.

**PC63/23      24/1161/FUL – CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO RESIDENTIAL USE IN ASSOCIATION WITH FORTUNES FARM INCLUDING EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING STABLE BLOCK TO HOME OFFICE AND GYM AT FORTUNES FARMHOUSE, HIGH ELMS LANE, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WATFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD25 0JY**

The Planning Officer provided the following two updates:

Abbots Langley Parish Council noted the application on reconsultation, and officers also wish to propose a revised wording of condition four (C4). Officers proposed the wording *“the extended and converted building, hereby permitted as a home office, domestic storage and gym, shall not be occupied or used at any other time other than incidental to the enjoyment of and ancillary to the residential dwelling located on the site”*, the relevant plan number shown in brackets.

Members of the Committee expressed concerns about the lack of clarity regarding the application for residential use, given the building's apparent design and function as an office space. They highlighted the absence of a door between the store and gym area, questioning the need for two parking spaces if the building is to serve as a residence. They emphasised that the building resembles an office rather than a home and raised issues about the implications of increased traffic and parking in a rural area. The officer responded by affirming that the imposed conditions aim to maintain control over the building's use, ensuring it remains ancillary to the main dwelling.

Members also questioned the ambiguous definition of a home office and the implications of its use concerning residential regulations. The officer confirmed that the classification of a home office is subjective and contingent upon its ancillary role to the residence. The officer advised that should concerns arise about a home office evolving into a separate commercial enterprise, permission would be required under separate cover. The discussion also addressed enforcement challenges, emphasising that enforcement relies heavily on external notifications and that any investigation into potential misuse would be reactive rather than proactive.



Members further argued that the proposed plan does not adequately serve the needs of residents, particularly highlighting that the space labelled as a 'board/training room' does not align with the concept of a home office. They stressed the importance of ensuring that the space is primarily for the occupants rather than for external use. Several Members raised questions about the appropriateness of the application, suggesting that it may be more suitable to classify the space as an office rather than a home office.

Members also pointed out that the proposed extension is located in a green belt area. They highlighted the existing traffic issues on High Elms Lane, emphasising that the narrow country lane already struggles with congestion due to its access to local schools and the crematorium. Members questioned the feasibility of accommodating additional residents without adequate public transport options and raised doubts about the source of extra vehicles if the new occupants cannot drive. They argued that the development will exacerbate these issues by introducing additional vehicles, especially since there is no public transport available. They emphasised the importance of maintaining the integrity of the green belt and questioned the ability to control the impact of such developments in this sensitive area.

The officer suggested deferring the application to allow officers more time to gather information about the proposed use of the building. This approach aims to facilitate a more informed and comprehensive debate once additional details from the applicant are available.

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved, seconded by Councillor Chris Whately-Smith, that the application is deferred to enable officers to seek further information in respect of the details of the proposed use.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair, the voting being 7 For, 1 Against, 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That the application is deferred to enable officers to seek further information in respect of the details of the proposed use.

**PC64/23      PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0476/OUT: OUTLINE APPLICATION:  
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE, DELIVERING UP TO 300 NO.  
RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3), ASSOCIATED ACCESS, AND  
SUPPORTING AMENITY SPACE, LANDSCAPING, GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND  
SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS (ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR  
ACCESS) AT LAND EAST OF GREEN STREET AND NORTH OF ORCHARD DRIVE  
CHORLEYWOOD**

PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0476/OUT and PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0538/OUT were debated by the Committee at the same time.

Councillors Davies and Hearn left the room at 8.50pm.

For item 12, the Planning Officer advised that the Lead Local Flood Authority have responded and raised no objection, and one further letter of objection had been received.

For item 13, the Planning Officer advised that the Lead Local Flood Authority have responded and raised no objection, and two further letters of objection have been received, one raising concerns at the amount of housing proposed and one raising concerns about the consideration given to Great Crested Newts.

The Planning Officer introduced the application, clarifying that the purpose is to gather concerns and issues from Members, without making decisions that evening. The officer also highlighted the ongoing assessment by the local authority and some consultees, noting the

absence of comments from Hertfordshire County Council Highways department and the response from the flood authority, which raised no objections subject to conditions. The officers emphasised the importance of public input and the procedural steps before a decision can be made.

A District Councillor spoke against the application.

A Parish Councillor spoke against the item.

Mr. Finnan spoke against the item.

Mr. Morgan spoke in support of the item.

Members raised concerns regarding the government's upcoming changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), expected in October. They raised questions about how these changes might impact the applications if implemented before their determination. They highlighted that any new national planning policy would serve as a material consideration during the assessment of the application, despite the existing development plan remaining unchanged. Members expressed worry about the potential implications of these changes and anticipated that reports at that time would clarify the differences and their effects on the assessment process.

Members highlighted the busy road between Chorleywood and Chalfont and Latimer, noting its relevance to the discussion. They agreed that scheduling a site visit could provide a clearer picture due to reduced traffic.

The Committee debated the two proposed housing developments in Chorleywood, after several suggestions to discuss both applications at the same time. The debate was focusing on the implications for local infrastructure, particularly schools and traffic. Key points included concerns about the adequacy of local school places, with estimates suggesting a need for new primary and secondary school facilities due to the anticipated increase in population. Traffic issues were also raised, especially regarding road junctions and the impact of additional vehicles during peak times, as well as the nearby bridge, where lorries may not be able to turn the corner. It was suggested that the site visit should be during school drop-off or pick-up times.

The necessity for thorough assessments of the environmental and infrastructural impacts, including the potential strain on local services and the need for improved transport links, was emphasised. Further issues were raised on sewer problems, lack of school places for the new development, and a need for a two-form entry primary school. However, officers advised that Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) as education authority have said they didn't think that the new development would generate sufficient children to require a new primary school.

Members also pointed out that an independent ecology report would be needed to understand the implications of the development, and also mentioned that the impact on the water system needs further investigation due to capacity concerns. They also mentioned potential parking issues.

Members requested that officers follow up with the consultees who have not yet responded.

Mr. Morgan clarified the necessity of a full two-form entry school in relation to their development proposal for a 675 unit scheme. He explained that the proposed school is an over-provision compared to what is required, and highlighted that this has been noted in their submission and the office report. The additional school provision is presented as a public benefit, despite the current 300 unit scheme not necessitating a school as part of its application.

Several Members expressed scepticism about the adequacy of current assessments and the need for further information before making decisions.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That Members agree for officers to arrange a site visit prior to this application being presented to Planning Committee for a decision.
- (2) That the Committee notes the report and is invited to make general comments with regard to the material planning issues raised by the application.

**PC65/23 PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0538/OUT: OUTLINE APPLICATION: DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING FARM BUILDING AND COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE, DELIVERING UP TO 675 NO. RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3), A NEW TWO-FORM ENTRY PRIMARY SCHOOL, ASSOCIATED ACCESS, AND SUPPORTING AMENITY SPACE, LANDSCAPING, GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS (ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR ACCESS) AT LAND EAST OF GREEN STREET AND NORTH OF ORCHARD DRIVE CHORLEYWOOD**

PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0476/OUT and PRELIMINARY REPORT: 24/0538/OUT were debated by the Committee at the same time.

Councillors Davies and Hearn left the room at 8.50pm.

For item 12, the Planning Officer advised that the Lead Local Flood Authority have responded and raised no objection, and one further letter of objection had been received.

For item 13, the Planning Officer advised that the Lead Local Flood Authority have responded and raised no objection, and two further letters of objection have been received, one raising concerns at the amount of housing proposed and one raising concerns about the consideration given to Great Crested Newts.

The Planning Officer introduced the application, clarifying that the purpose is to gather concerns and issues from Members, without making decisions that evening. The officer also highlighted the ongoing assessment by the local authority and some consultees, noting the absence of comments from Hertfordshire County Council Highways department and the response from the flood authority, which raised no objections subject to conditions. The officers emphasised the importance of public input and the procedural steps before a decision can be made.

A District Councillor spoke against the application.

A Parish Councillor spoke against the item.

Mr. Finnan spoke against the item.

Mr. Morgan spoke in support of the item.

Members raised concerns regarding the government's upcoming changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), expected in October. They raised questions about how these changes might impact the applications if implemented before their determination. They highlighted that any new national planning policy would serve as a material consideration during the assessment of the application, despite the existing development plan remaining unchanged. Members expressed worry about the potential implications of these changes and anticipated that reports at that time would clarify the differences and their effects on the assessment process.

Members highlighted the busy road between Chorleywood and Chalfont and Latimer, noting its relevance to the discussion. They agreed that scheduling a site visit could provide a clearer picture due to reduced traffic.

The Committee debated the two proposed housing developments in Chorleywood, after several suggestions to discuss both applications at the same time. The debate was focusing on the implications for local infrastructure, particularly schools and traffic. Key points included concerns about the adequacy of local school places, with estimates suggesting a need for new primary and secondary school facilities due to the anticipated increase in population. Traffic issues were also raised, especially regarding road junctions and the impact of additional vehicles during peak times, as well as the nearby bridge, where lorries may not be able to turn the corner. It was suggested that the site visit should be during school drop-off or pick-up times.

The necessity for thorough assessments of the environmental and infrastructural impacts, including the potential strain on local services and the need for improved transport links, was emphasised. Further issues were raised on sewer problems, lack of school places for the new development, and a need for a two-form entry primary school. However, officers advised that Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) as education authority have said they didn't think that the new development would generate sufficient children to require a new primary school.

Members also pointed out that an independent ecology report would be needed to understand the implications of the development, and also mentioned that the impact on the water system needs further investigation due to capacity concerns. They also mentioned potential parking issues.

Members requested that officers follow up with the consultees who have not yet responded.

Mr. Morgan clarified the necessity of a full two-form entry school in relation to their development proposal for a 675 unit scheme. He explained that the proposed school is an over-provision compared to what is required, and highlighted that this has been noted in their submission and the office report. The additional school provision is presented as a public benefit, despite the current 300 unit scheme not necessitating a school as part of its application.

Several Members expressed scepticism about the adequacy of current assessments and the need for further information before making decisions.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That Members agree for officers to arrange a site visit prior to this application being presented to Planning Committee for a decision.
- (2) That the Committee notes the report and is invited to make general comments with regard to the material planning issues raised by the application.

**PC66/23      OTHER BUSINESS - IF APPROVED UNDER ITEM 3 ABOVE**

There were no items of other business.

**CHAIR**