THREE RIVERS DISTRICT COUNCIL

Three Rivers House
Northway
Rickmansworth
Herts WD3 1RL

Planning Committee
MINUTES

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on Tuesday, 31 March 2026 from 7.30 - 9.14 pm

Present: Councillors Chris Whately-Smith (Chair), Elinor Gazzard, Oliver Cooper, Steve Drury, Philip Hearn, Chris Lloyd, Keith Martin, Reena Ranger and Narinder Sian

Also in Attendance:

Parish Councillor Diana Barber (Batchworth Community Council) and Parish Councillor Andrew Gallagher (Croxley Green Parish Council)

Officers in Attendance:

Emma Lund, Senior Committee Officer
Lilly Varnham, Planning Officer
Scott Volker, Principal Planning Officer
Claire Westwood, Development Management Team Leader

PC120/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

Councillor Keith Martin replaced Councillor Harry Davies, Councillor Narinder Sian replaced Councillor Chris Mitchell and Councillor Reena Ranger replaced Councillor Debbie Morris.

PC121/25 NOTICE OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

PC122/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

PC123/25 25/1346/FUL – CONVERSION OF EXISTING BUILDING INTO 6NO. (USE CLASS C3) RESIDENTIAL UNITS WITH ASSOCIATED BIKE STORE, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WORKS AT CROXLEY HOUSE, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH WD3 3JB

The application was for conversion of existing building into 6no. (Use Class C3) residential units with associated bike store, parking and landscaping works at Croxley House, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth.

The planning application and associated listed building consent application at agenda item 5 were considered together.

The Planning Officer provided an update that, whilst it was not a planning matter, the applicant had been in contact with the Council's Property Team regarding rights of access and discussions were ongoing.

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

The agent spoke in favour of the application.

Points raised by the speaker against the proposal included: concerns about inadequate parking, access across The Green and safety at the road junction; concerns about parking of construction vehicles during development and possible parking on The Green; and the narrowness of the access track.

Points raised by the speaker in favour of the proposal included: the proposal would enable a site which had been vacant since 2021 to be quickly brought back into use and would provide 6 residential dwellings; the application had been shaped through positive and proactive engagement; it would ensure that the physical external presence of the building remained untouched and would respect its listing and local importance; there were no technical objections; and the proposal was policy compliant.

In response to the concerns raised by the Parish Councillor, the Planning Officer responded that the slight shortfall (2 spaces) in parking provision against the policy requirement was acknowledged; however, the provision of 2 spaces per unit plus 3 visitors' spaces was considered acceptable and the parking shortfall was not deemed sufficient to justify refusal for the reasons set out in the report. With regard to safety issues, the Highways Officer had reviewed the details and did not consider that there were any highways safety reasons for refusal. The concerns about the access and construction traffic were understood, and a Construction Management Plan could be conditioned as part of the full application in order to address concerns around materials delivery and contractor parking.

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

- The Planning Committee had previously resolved (in November 2023) to grant a change of use to a children's nursery, although that decision had not yet been issued due to the lack of the required S106 agreement. That application had included a proposal to widen the existing access track, which had been considered necessary to make the application acceptable in planning terms. The application which was now before the committee did not propose any alterations to the access track, and the Highways Authority considered that the existing access arrangements were acceptable in terms of the current application. The Planning Officer clarified that the applicant's discussions with the Council's Property Team related to rights of access across the land rather than any proposal to change the access.

- In response to a question from a Committee Member as to whether an informative could be included regarding ongoing use of the site by the West Herts Beekeeper's Association, the Planning Officer responded that any agreement for the Association to continue to use the site would be a civil, and not a planning, matter. Addition of an informative would therefore not be appropriate.

- A Committee Member commented that the proposal would result in enhancement to the building which was in a poor state of repair and would guarantee its future.

- In response to the concerns expressed by the speaker from the Parish Council about construction vehicles, equipment or materials being placed on The Green during construction, Committee Members supported the addition of a condition requiring a Construction Management Plan. It was also recommended that this should seek to divert

construction traffic away from Sarratt Road, with access to the site instead being from the Rickmansworth side.

- With regard to car parking, the Planning Officer drew attention to the constraints of the site with regard to the amount of parking which could be provided. This included the need to protect the adjacent mature trees. The Planning Officer advised that a Parking Management Plan could be conditioned to alleviate concerns around the parking provision; this could also include a requirement for the parking spaces to be allocated to particular units or as visitor spaces.

- It was noted that the application largely proposed internal changes only, with the exception of some changes to windows (details of which were required to be supplied by condition) and the removal of an external metal staircase and railings. Whilst the Conservation Officer had noted that the boundary wall was in a poor state of repair, and the applicant had indicated that this would form the subject of a separate planning application, repairs to the wall did not form part of this application.

- In debate Committee Members noted the benefits of the application in terms of bringing the building back into use in a way which was sympathetic to its heritage. A Committee Member attributed very significant weight to the provision of self-contained accommodation; significant weight to the improvement of the conservation of the listed building; but also significant weight to the shortfall in parking due to the lack of availability of any additional parking.

- In response to a recommendation from a Committee Member that the applicant should be required to reinstate any damage to The Green which might arise, for example, from the use of the narrow access by construction vehicles, the Planning Officer reported that this was not a planning matter but would instead form part of the discussions with the Council's Property Team about the use of the access track, although an advisory informative could be added in relation to the protection of The Green.

Councillor Lloyd moved, and Councillor Drury seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions, the addition of conditions requiring a Construction Management Plan and a Parking Management Plan, and the addition of an informative regarding protection of The Green during works.

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

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions, the addition of conditions requiring a Construction Management Plan and a Parking Management Plan, and the addition of an informative regarding protection of The Green during works.

PC124/25 25/1347/LBC – LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: CONVERSION OF EXISTING BUILDING INTO 6NO. (USE CLASS C3) RESIDENTIAL UNITS WITH ASSOCIATED BIKE STORE, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING WORKS AT CROXLEY HOUSE, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 3JB

The application was for listed building consent for conversion of existing building into 6no. (Use Class C3) residential units with associated bike store, parking and landscaping works at Croxley House, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth.

The application was considered together with the full planning application.

Councillor Lloyd moved, and Councillor Drury seconded, that listed building consent be granted subject to conditions.

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

RESOLVED:

That listed building consent be granted subject to conditions.

PC125/25 25/1984/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF PART-SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS, FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION; LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING ROOF EXTENSION WITH REAR DORMERS AND ROOFLIGHTS, RELOCATION OF ENTRANCE DOOR, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION AND RAISED TERRACE TO THE REAR AT 43 CHESTNUT AVENUE, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTS WD3 4HA

The application was for construction of part-single, part two storey front and rear extensions; first floor side extension; loft conversion including roof extension with rear dormers and rooflights; relocation of entrance door; internal alterations and alterations to fenestration and raised terrace to the rear at 43 Chestnut Avenue, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that due to a Chorleywood Parish Council meeting taking place the same evening, no representative of the Parish Council was available to speak on the application. Parish Councillor Jon Bishop had therefore emailed the concerns of the Parish Council to Members of the Committee separately. These related largely to the impact on 45 Chestnut Avenue, which were discussed at paragraph 7.2.4 of the report.

In response to the Parish Councillor's comments, the Planning Officer clarified that the 45 degree splay line had been measured from the single storey flat roof extension adjacent to the boundary, and not from any other extension. Officers had reviewed the measurement and remained of the view that the proposal would not intrude the 45 degree line in relation to the neighbours on either side. It was therefore acceptable in terms of impact on neighbours. The Planning Officer reported that the previous objections from 45 Chestnut Avenue had been removed following the amended plans; however, 47 Chestnut Avenue maintained their objection due to concerns about overlooking arising from the dormer windows.

A local resident spoke against the application.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Concerns raised by the speaker against the application focussed on the impact of the dormer windows on the privacy of the rear garden at number 47. A previous refusal for dormer windows at a different property near the site on the grounds of inappropriateness was cited. The speaker commented that there were alternatives to dormer windows which were less impactful; and raised concerns about the precedent for dormer windows at other properties, and the resulting wider impact on the road, should the application be approved.

Points raised by the speaker in favour of the application included the proposal's compliance with local policies; the development respected the scale, massing and context of the surrounding area; there was no impact on neighbouring amenity; and the proposal represented an appropriate and sustainable enhancement to the existing property.

In response to the concerns raised by the speaker against the proposal, the Planning Officer responded that the two dormer windows were set in from the boundaries and the flanks of the dwelling and were directed towards the rear garden of the application site. Whilst there may be some oblique views of the neighbouring gardens, these would be towards the rear parts of the gardens rather than the immediately adjacent private spaces. The views from the dormer windows would not significantly differ from first floor rear windows which could be sited much closer to the boundary, and the placement of the dormers relative to the neighbours was not an unusual relationship. Officers did not, therefore, consider that there would be sufficient

harm to justify refusal of the application on the grounds of the impact of the dormer windows on neighbouring amenity.

Committee Members asked questions about the details of the application which were responded to by officers.

In response to a Committee Member's questions, the Planning Officer reported that the screening required by Condition 5 was considered to be an acceptable mitigation for the impact on neighbours of the raised patio and the raised patio would not result in harm to neighbouring amenity. Details of the screening were conditioned to be supplied to officers in order to ensure that this objective was met.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor Cooper seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 8 for, 0 against, 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

PC126/25 25/2228/RSP – PART-RETROSPECTIVE: CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AT 10 GADE BANK, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 3GD

The application was part-retrospective for construction of a single storey rear extension at 10 Gade Bank, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates, but summarised both the recent planning history at the site and the scope of the application, as set out in the report. Members were reminded that concerns about past or future use of the property as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) were not a material planning consideration in the assessment of the application.

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

A local resident spoke against the application.

Comments made by speakers against the proposal included: previous use of the property as an HMO and previous changes made using permitted development rights had caused harm to the community; future use should be as a single dwelling house only and not multiple occupancy; the applicant was unwilling to contribute to road repairs which had been agreed to by other local householders; and there had been noise disruption to neighbours who should have the right to peaceful enjoyment of their properties.

In responding to the speakers' comments, the Planning Officer clarified that the application before the Committee related to the rear extension only. Concerns about the use of the property as an HMO which had been raised during the consideration of the previous application (refused in November 2025) were not a material planning consideration in this application. Officers had considered the potential for including a condition which restricted use to a single family dwelling; however, this had not been considered reasonable and compliant with the tests within the NPPF, as it was not reasonable to attach a condition which related to the use of the whole property to a permission for an extension.

The Planning Officer advised that following the refusal of the previous application the applicant was seeking to make alterations to the extension which addressed the reasons for refusal, principally: replacing the set of two doors and two windows in the rear elevation with a set of

bi-folding doors, and replacing the white render to the external walls to match the existing property.

The applicant had also shown an intent to make alterations to the internal layout of the property to restore it to use as a single dwelling house. These included replacing the two ensuite bedrooms in the rear extension with a living and dining area; removal of the ensuite bathrooms to the upstairs bedrooms; reinstatement of a family bathroom; and replacement of the kitchen in the loft space with a walk-in wardrobe. However, these changes did not form part of this application.

The Planning Officer reported that Condition C1 required the installation of the bi-folding doors and the application of the external pebbledash render to be completed within four months of the grant of permission, and confirmed that the existing enforcement case in relation to the unauthorised rear extension would remain open until officers were satisfied that the works had been completed in accordance with the planning permission, if granted.

In discussion Committee Members noted that concerns about noise, placing of services such as bathrooms, and insulation were building control matters and not material planning considerations.

Whilst recognising that it was not a material planning consideration, Committee Members were supportive of the applicant's stated intention to return the use of the property to a single dwelling house.

Councillor Drury moved, and Councillor Lloyd seconded, that part-retrospective planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 8 for, 0 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

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

(Note: the meeting was briefly paused during this item to allow Councillor Ranger to leave the room. The meeting resumed when Councillor Ranger re-entered the room).

PC127/25 26/0041/RSP - PART RETROSPECTIVE: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE, WORKSHOP AND FRONT CANOPY; CONSTRUCTION OF PART SINGLE, PART TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS; TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSIONS; FRONT AND REAR DORMERS; INSTALLATION OF CHIMNEY; RAISED REAR PATIO; ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION INCLUDING INSTALLATION OF ROOF LIGHTS; RELOCATION OF FRONT ENTRANCE AT 11 PEMBROKE ROAD, MOOR PARK, NORTHWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE HA6 2HP

The application was part-retrospective for demolition of existing garage, workshop and front canopy; construction of part single, part two-storey rear extensions; two-storey side extensions; front and rear dormers; installation of chimney; raised rear patio; alterations to fenestration including installation of roof lights; relocation of front entrance at 11 Pembroke Road, Moor Park, Northwood.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates.

A representative of Moor Park (1958) Ltd spoke against the application.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Parish Councillor Diana Barber spoke on the application.

Concerns raised by speakers against the application included: the number of planning applications associated with the site and the resulting increases to the size of the property and site coverage, which had an impact on the conservation area; works being carried out which were not in compliance with approved plans, necessitating a retrospective application; lack of compliance with the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal guidance due to site coverage; and the excessive width of the development and close proximity to the boundary with 9 Pembroke Road.

Points raised by the speaker in favour of the application included: the application would regularise and bring together a number of applications; Council officers were satisfied that all works had now been carried out in accordance with planning permissions; and there were no objections from the Conservation Officer.

In response to the points raised by the speakers against the proposal, the Planning Officer clarified that a planning application for the rear extension had been approved in 2024. Two applications, which had both been permitted, had subsequently varied conditions to increase the depth of the extension across the total elevation at the ground floor. A further planning application, which had been broadly the same as the application which was approved but with the absence of the two-storey side extension, had been refused by the Local Planning Authority in 2024 but allowed on appeal. There were therefore currently two schemes being implemented at the site under one building operation: the application before the Committee sought to regularise the development as implemented and consolidate the approved position.

In relation to plot coverage, the Planning Officer acknowledged that this would exceed the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal guidance; however, assessment of the application required consideration of the site situation alongside the policies. The approved position already allowed a development which exceeded the plot coverage guidance, and the small additional increase arising from this application was predominantly to the rear. Officers did not consider that it would undermine the spacious and open character of the Moor Park estate, and the Conservation Officer had raised no objection. In order to prevent further development of the plot, officers were recommending a condition restricting permitted development rights under Class E.

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 commented that the removal of Class E permitted development rights was a gain in terms of preserving the Moor Park Conservation Area, as the gardens were a major contributor to the spacious and open character of the conservation area. Additionally, this benefit outweighed the harm of the small increase in plot coverage above the Conservation Area appraisal guidance.

- A Committee Member suggested that in addition to Class E, there may be other classes of permitted development rights which should be removed in order to prevent further development at the site. The Planning Officer responded that the applicant had already utilised most rights under class A, and so removal of this class of permitted development rights was not considered to be reasonable or necessary. Additionally, Condition C5 restricted further openings in the first-floor side elevations or roof slopes of the extension. Officers had considered all classes of permitted development rights in assessing the application, but there were not considered to be planning reasons to remove any permitted development rights other than Class E.

- In response to a Committee Member's concerns about the potential for overlooking arising from the raised patio, the Planning Officer advised that the patio was set in from both boundaries and was not regarded to have a harmful impact on neighbouring amenity. A privacy screen was conditioned, and this was considered to be appropriate mitigation to safeguard neighbouring amenity.

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 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

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

PC128/25 ITEM WITHDRAWN 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, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 3DU

This item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.

CHAIR