

PLANNING COMMITTEE – Wednesday 27 May 2026

25/0980/RSP – Part Retrospective: Removal of original front canopy porch; removal of original chimney stack; removal of original ridge tiles and finials; removal of original bargeboards; construction of single-storey front extension, including new porch with new front door and fenestration and window to replace garage door; replacement windows; construction of new chimney stack; cream painted render; replacement ridge tiles and finials, construction of single-storey rear extension and associated raised patio; rear rooflight; removal of front landscaping and driveway extension; and alterations to front boundary treatment, including brick slips to rendered front walls at SANDS, SHIRE LANE, CHORLEYWOOD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 5NH

Parish: Chorleywood Parish Council
Expiry of Statutory Period: 20.08.2025
Extension of time: agreed to 29.05.2026

Ward: Chorleywood South & Maple Cross
Case Officer: Tom Norris

Recommendation: That Part Retrospective Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: Called in by Chorleywood Parish Council unless Officers are minded to refuse due to the impact on the Conservation Area and neighbours.

To view all documents forming part of this application please go to the following website:
<https://www3.threerivers.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=SXDBCXQFGRX00>

1. Relevant Planning & Enforcement History

- 1.1 25/0981/RSP – Part-retrospective: Loft conversion including construction of rear dormer, removal of chimney stack; removal of ridge tiles and finials; and first floor side extension. – 22.04.2026 – **Refused**

R1 The proposed development, including the retention of the rear box dormer, by virtue of its scale, external finish material and fenestration detailing; and proposed side extension, by virtue of its scale, introduces incongruous features which harm the character and appearance of the dwelling, neither preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the dwelling. Furthermore, the individual and cumulative removal of original features associated with the loft conversion, including the chimney stack, crested ridge tiles, and finials has harmfully eroded the positive contribution that the dwelling made to the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area. The collective impact of the proposal therefore erodes the positive contribution the dwelling has towards the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area and results in a moderate level of less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. The public benefits identified do not outweigh the harm. The development is therefore 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), Policies 1 and 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan (August 2020), Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area Appraisal (2005), and the NPPF (2024).

- 1.2 24/0581/RSP - Part Retrospective: Demolition of existing utility room and rear window; construction of single storey rear extension, conversion of garage into habitable accommodation; insertion of rear dormer; internal alterations and alterations to fenestration - 19.06.2024 – **Refused**

R1 The development by virtue of the collective loss of key traditional and original characteristic features such as the chimney, front entrance door, front porch canopy and front windows has unacceptably eroded the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension and rear dormer window are further unsympathetic additions to the host dwelling by virtue of their design and in respect of the dormer its lack of subordination and fenestration detailing. The collective impact of the development would therefore adversely affect the character of the dwelling which in turn has a negative impact upon its contribution towards the character and appearance of Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area. The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm when considered against paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF); however, no public benefits have been identified which outweigh the harm. As such the development is contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM1 and DM3 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (2013), Policies 1 and 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan (2020), the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area Appraisal (2005) and the NPPF (2023).

1.3 24/0053/COMP – Enforcement Case: Unauthorised Building works – Pending investigation (see paragraph 2.4).

2. Site Description

2.1 The application site contains a detached dwelling located on the south-eastern side of Shire Lane, Chorleywood.

2.2 The application site is located within the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area. The land levels slope downward in an eastern direction on the street. The area can be characterised by Victorian and Edwardian detached dwellings of varied design.

2.3 Prior to any works being undertaken, the application dwelling was a good example of the Victorian/Edwardian era development found within the Conservation Area and made a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, largely through its historic interest and architectural features.

2.4 Unauthorised works have been carried out to the dwelling prior to obtaining any form of planning permission. Such works included the removal of architectural features, including the original chimney stack, crested ridge tiles and finials, and decorative bargeboards. An attractive front canopy porch feature has also been removed and replaced with a new enclosed porch. The pre-existing windows have been removed and replaced with new uPVC windows. The pre-existing roughcast render has been removed and replaced with new smooth white render. The pre-existing front door has been removed and replaced with a modern uPVC front door. A loft conversion has been undertaken including the construction of a flat roofed box dormer within the rear roofslope. A single-storey rear extension has been constructed with an associated raised patio. A new first-floor window has been inserted within the front elevation to the existing side extension. The pre-existing part landscaped frontage has been replaced with a gravel driveway. The low red brick walls and brick piers within the site frontage have been rendered with smooth white render.

2.5 An Article (4) Direction exists across the Conservation Area which removes the permitted development rights in relation to the Schedule 2, Part 1 - Classes A, C, D, E, F, H, Part 2 - Classes A and C and Part 31 - Class B.

3. Proposed Development

3.1 This application seeks part retrospective planning permission for the removal of original front canopy porch; removal of original chimney stack; removal of original ridge tiles and finials;

removal of original bargeboards; construction of single-storey front extension, including new porch with new front door and fenestration and window to replace garage door; replacement windows; construction of new chimney stack; cream painted render; replacement ridge tiles and finials, construction of single-storey rear extension and associated raised patio; rear rooflight; removal of front landscaping and driveway extension; and alterations to front boundary treatment, including brick slips to rendered front walls.

- 3.2 This application includes remedial works to rectify features removed from the dwelling and for a single-storey rear extension. A rear dormer window has been constructed to the main roof of the house however this was subject to a separate application which has been refused (25/0981/RSP). **This feature, while in-situ, does not form part of this application.**
- 3.3 As discussed above, pre-existing features to the dwelling have been removed, including the front canopy porch; chimney stack; ridge tiles and finials; and bargeboards. A single-storey front extension, including new porch with new front door and fenestration, has been constructed. The windows have also been replaced.
- 3.4 As part of remedial works, it is proposed that:
- A new chimney stack is constructed to replace the one removed.
 - The existing bright white render is painted in a cream colour.
 - Crested ridge tiles and finials are installed to the main ridge and front-facing gables.
 - Decorative timber bargeboards are reinstated to the front porch and gable to reflect the pre-existing.
 - The modern front door which is currently installed is replaced with a timber panelled door with associated glazing.
 - The existing windows are retained however solid glazing bars would be installed to the front windows.
 - A brick finish is applied to the rendered parts of the front wall to match the rest of the wall.
- 3.5 The landscaping to the site frontage has been removed and replaced with a gravel driveway. This is proposed to be retained.
- 3.6 A single-storey extension and raised patio have been constructed at the rear of the dwelling. The single-storey rear extension has a depth of 4.5m, a width of 7.8m, and has a flat roof, with an overall height of 3.0m. The raised patio has a depth of 2.0m, and a maximum height of 0.9m. The extension currently has a facing brick exterior finish and black framed rear doors and glazing. It is proposed that the extension is rendered in a colour to match the new off-white colour the dwelling is proposed to be painted.
- 3.7 Amended plans were received during the application. The original application proposed to regularise works carried out, with limited to no works to reinstate any features unlawfully removed from the dwelling. The amended plans proposed to reinstate features, which are all described above. The amended plans were accompanied by a materials schedule. All neighbours and consultees were re-consulted on amended plans.

4. Consultee Responses

4.1 Chorleywood Parish Council: **Objection**

Comments of 31.03.2026

The Committee wish to CALL IN this application with no changes to the original Call In. There have been no material changes and maintain the Call In as below.

The Committee had Objections to this application on the following grounds and wish to CALL IN, unless the Officers are minded to refuse.

- The applications (25/0980 and 25/0981) should be considered together as both the Local Plan Development Management Policies (DM1) and the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan explicitly require that the cumulative effect of applications is considered.
- The Committee noted that a similar proposal had been refused permission previously and, whilst there have been changes, in combination the two applications (25/0980 and 25/0981) are materially the same as the previous applications. Splitting the two planning applications in this way was artificial; it was not possible to determine one without considering the other.
- The Committee considered that the scale, size, mass and form of the rear extension proposed is out of keeping with the current dwelling and with dwellings in the Conservation Area generally.
- The square, flat-roofed form of the extension is not consistent with the design of the house, and this is exacerbated when considered in combination with the dormer proposed under 25/0981.
- The proposed development was also so close to the boundary with the neighbouring property that it appeared unneighbourly and had the potential to affect the amenity of the residents of the neighbouring property.

Should the plans or supporting information be amended by the Applicant, please advise the Parish Council so the comments can be updated to reflect the amended.

Comments of 01.08.2025

The Committee had Objections to this application and application reference 25/0981 on the following grounds and wish to CALL IN, unless the Officers are minded to refuse.

- The applications (25/0980 and 25/0981) should be considered together as both the Local Plan Development Management Policies (DM1) and the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan explicitly require that the cumulative effect of applications is considered. The Committee noted that a similar proposal had been refused permission previously and, whilst there have been changes, in combination the two applications (25/0980 and 25/0981) are materially the same as the previous applications. Splitting the two planning applications in this way was artificial; it was not possible to determine one without considering the other.
- The Committee considered that the scale, size, mass and form of the rear extension proposed is out of keeping with the current dwelling and with dwellings in the Conservation Area generally. The square, flat-roofed form of the extension is not consistent with the design of the house, and this is exacerbated when considered in combination with the dormer proposed under 25/0981.
- The proposed development was also so close to the boundary with the neighbouring property that it appeared unneighbourly and had the potential to affect the amenity of the residents of the neighbouring property.

Should the plans or supporting information be amended by the Applicant, please advise the Parish Council so the comments can be updated to reflect the amended.

4.2 Conservation Officer:

Since the receipt of the below written comments, in which this consultee raised an objection, the proposed development has been discussed verbally with this consultee throughout negotiation and receipt of amendments. Officers agree with the level of harm identified by the Conservation Officer regarding the unlawful works undertaken. No further written comments have been received.

Written comments of 17.11.2026

Heritage Significance

The property is in the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area. The adopted Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) adopted in 2005 highlights the mix of Victorian and Edwardian buildings and that it is a very good example of the Victorian/Edwardian era planned development, with uniquely designed houses. The property is within the Shire Lane Sub Area in the CAA. A nearby property within the Conservation Area is the Grade II Listed Roman Catholic Church of St John Fisher (List Entry Number 1100866), which was designed by the famous Arts and Crafts architect C.F.A Voysey. Voysey's self-designed home The Orchard which is Grade I listed (List Entry Number:1348234) is further to the southwest on Shire Lane, although outside the Conservation Area.

Sands is highlighted as being of special interest within the CAA appendix, with the rough-cast walls and timber windows highlighted, with the only detracting feature highlighted as the flat roofed garage. Prior to the recent works, the property made a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, largely through its historic interest and architectural features such as the use of roughcast, small front dormer and decorative detail to the roof, front dormer, front door surround, etc.

Planning History

An application was refused in 2024 under reference 24/0581/FUL; the Conservation Officer consultation response raised concerns in relation to the proposed rear box dormer, the loss of the porch and chimney and concerns around impacts from works to the windows.

In response to unauthorised works, a Conservation Officer consultation response raised concerns in relation to removal of the chimney, removal of the decorative ridge tiles, replacement of the front dormer, alterations to the front gable, addition of a large front porch and large rear dormer, replacement of rough cast render with a smoother render, addition of gravel to the front of driveway and two white rendered pillars added adjacent to the existing flint wall. The loss of architectural detailing of the property and other alterations described above resulted in harm to the Arts and Crafts character of the property, and resultant harm to the character of the Conservation Area.

Current Proposal

In the current proposal, the plans appear to show no rear dormer and replacement of the pre-existing chimney, and replacement of the removed roof ridge tiles, which would all be supported in heritage terms.

A single storey rear extension could be acceptable in principle, but the depth, design and extent of glazing with modern black aluminium framing is harmful in heritage terms and is not supported.

There is no in-principle objection to the conversion of the garage into a habitable space, but the current windows in the garage are not in keeping with the traditional character and are not supported.

The new window proposed to the first-floor side extension would not be in keeping with the original character and would not be supported.

The retentions of replacement of all previous timber framed single glazed windows with uPVC double-glazed windows and use of a high security aluminium door would be harmful

to the tradition character and would not be supported. The retention of the porch as built would not be supported.

The alterations to the driveway including gravel and white posts are harmful in character and are not supported.

In addition, this application has been submitted concurrently with application reference 25/0981/RSP, which includes retention of several works that would be harmful to the character of the property and the Conservation Area.

For the reasons highlighted above, the works would not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area and would be contrary to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 212 requires great weight to be given to the asset's conservation when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset. The degree of harm would be less than substantial as per paragraph 215.

4.3 National Grid (Gas): No response received.

5. Neighbour Consultation

5.1 Site/Press Notice:

- Site notice posted: 22.07.2025, expired: 12.08.2025.
- Press notice published: 04.07.2025, expired: 25.07.2025.

5.2 No. consulted: 13.

5.3 Neighbours were consulted on 26.06.2025 on the originally submitted plans and then re-consulted on 10.03.2026 on amended plans.

5.4 Number of responses received: 2 (Objection)

5.5 Summary of responses:

- The plans do not reflect what has been built.
- Some works have not been finished properly.
- Concerns from overlooking from dormer and flank windows which are not obscure glazed.
- Original and period features to the property have been removed.
- Amended plans have addressed certain items.
- Parallel application for rear dormer has not been taken into consideration.
- Objection to the scale of rear dormer.
- Changes will not bring property back to its previous heritage appearance.
- Enforcement notice has been ignored.
- Lack of regard for the Conservation Area.

Officer comment: As referenced in throughout report, the rear dormer and the separate application that this is subject of (25/0981/RSP) has been **refused**. This does not form part of this proposal and, as an isolated feature, has been deemed as unacceptable thus has been refused.

5.6 All other material planning considerations are addressed in this report.

6. Relevant Local and National Policies

6.1 Legislation

- 6.1.1 Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise as set out within S38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
- 6.1.2 S72 of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires LPAs to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
- 6.1.3 The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011. The Growth and Infrastructure Act achieved Royal Assent on 25 April 2013.
- 6.1.4 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Habitat Regulations 1994 may also be relevant.
- 6.1.5 The Environment Act 2021.

6.2 Policy & Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

- 6.2.1 In December 2024 the revised NPPF was published, to be read alongside the online National Planning Practice Guidance. The NPPF is clear that "existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework".
- 6.2.2 The NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits unless there is a clear reason for refusing the development (harm to a protected area).

The Three Rivers Local Development Plan

- 6.2.3 The application has been considered against the policies of the Local Plan, including the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) and the Site Allocations Local Development Document (adopted November 2014) as well as government guidance. The policies of Three Rivers District Council reflect the content of the NPPF.
- 6.2.4 The Core Strategy was adopted on 17 October 2011 having been through a full public participation process and Examination in Public. Relevant policies include Policies CP1, CP9, CP10, and CP12.
- 6.2.5 The Development Management Policies Local Development Document (DMLDD) was adopted on 26 July 2013 after the Inspector concluded that it was sound following Examination in Public which took place in March 2013. Relevant policies include DM1, DM3, DM6, DM9, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.
- 6.2.6 Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan (Referendum Version, August 2020). Relevant policies include Policy 1 and Policy 2.

6.3 Other

- 6.3.1 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (adopted February 2015)

6.3.2 Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area Appraisal (2005).

6.3.3 Chorleywood Station Estate Article 4(2) Direction 2006.

7. Analysis

7.1 Site Overview

7.1.1 As discussed in the above sections of this report, unauthorised works have been undertaken at the site. No planning permission is in place for the works carried out to date. Works undertaken include the removal of characterful features to the dwelling, causing a change in its overall character and appearance. These works have included the removal of the chimney, porch, ridge tiles, finials, decorative bargeboards, rendering of the house, and replacement windows.

7.1.2 Additional works include the construction of a single-storey rear extension and associated raised patio. A rear dormer window has been constructed to the main roof of the house. As noted above, this feature of the development was subject of a separate application which has been refused (25/0981/RSP). **This feature, while in-situ, does not form part of this application.**



The application dwelling prior to any works in 2024 (left), and following completion of works in 2025 (right)

7.2 Impact upon Character and Street Scene and Conservation Area

7.2.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy seeks to promote buildings of a high enduring design quality that respect local distinctiveness and Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area'.

7.2.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that extensions should not have a significant impact on the visual amenities of an area. Extensions should not be excessively prominent and should respect the existing character of the dwelling, particularly regarding the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors, and materials.

7.2.3 The application site is located within the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area. In relation to development proposals in Conservation Areas Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies LDD stipulates that development will only be permitted if it preserves or enhances the character of the area. Furthermore, it states that development should not harm important views into, out or within the Conservation Area.

- 7.2.4 The Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan is relevant and includes policies relating to development within the Conservation Areas in the Parish. Policy 1 states that Development proposals in conservation areas should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and use materials that are appropriate as defined in the relevant conservation area appraisal document. It further states that development proposals in the Conservation Areas should seek to maintain local distinctiveness through the built environment. Policy 2 states that all developments must demonstrate how they are in keeping with, and where possible enhance, the Special Characteristics of Chorleywood. The Neighbourhood Plan also makes general reference to the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area, stating that it is an excellent example of late Victorian and Edwardian buildings which give the estate its unique character dominated by large, detached houses and substantial rear gardens.
- 7.2.5 The Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area Appraisal (2005) provides supplementary planning guidance and is a material planning consideration in the assessment of applications within the conservation area. The appraisal states that the Conservation Area is characterised by a quite splendid and pleasant mix of both Victorian and Edwardian buildings. Many of these buildings display very attractive original features. The Conservation Area is a very good example of the Victorian/Edwardian era planned development. No two houses are alike and are rich in features of the time, such as timber vertically sliding sash windows, stained-glass windows and other architectural decoration. The application dwelling is also on the local list of notable dwellings on Shire Lane in the appraisal.
- 7.2.6 As set out within the application description and discussed in earlier sections of this report, original and characterful features of the dwelling have been removed without permission. The removal of all these features has eroded the positive contribution that the dwelling makes to the Conservation Area.
- 7.2.7 The pre-existing windows to the dwelling, which were a combination of timber sash windows and timber casement windows. These have been removed and replaced with uPVC casement windows. It is noted that the pre-existing windows were timber, and some may have been the original units. It is also noted that there was some variation throughout the pre-existing units to the dwelling, and they did not have a particularly strong collective appearance value. It is considered that the removal of the pre-existing units would not have been objectionable in principle, subject to their replacement with new, sympathetic units. The units installed to the site are uPVC. It is acknowledged that, in their current form, they are not overly aesthetic in a heritage terms. It is proposed that solid glazing bars are installed to the top lights. These would make greater reference to the pre-existing units and to the wider conservation area. They would also have a more cohesive appearance across the front elevation. Overall, subject to the proposed alterations including the introduction of solid glazing bars, the character and appearance of the dwelling would be preserved relative to its pre-existing appearance.
- 7.2.8 The pre-existing roughcast, cream coloured render has been completely replaced with smooth, bright white render. It is noted that there are some examples of smooth render found throughout the Conservation Area, usually in more muted colours. While it is found, it is not considered to be particularly characteristic. In this case it is considered that harm arises from the combination of its smooth finish and bright white colour. It is retrospectively proposed that the render is painted a softer "Magnolia" colour. It is considered that painting the existing render the specified colour would overcome the identified harm of the existing render. While the render would not be roughcast as the pre-existing, it is factored into consideration that there are examples of smooth render found locally. Overall, it is considered, subject to the proposed retrospective painting of the dwelling, the proposed render would tone down the appearance of the house which would preserve the character and appearance of the dwelling relative to its pre-existing appearance.

- 7.2.9 The pre-existing low wall and piers enclosing the frontage, were constructed of a combination of red brick and flint. This feature has been rendered with a smooth, bright white render to one internal side and to both piers. In its current state, it is considered to harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and Conservation Area. It is proposed that red stock brick slips are applied to the white rendered parts of the wall and piers. The material for which has been specified on the accompanying materials schedule. Subject to the proposed alterations, including the installation of brick slips, the character and appearance of the dwelling would be preserved relative to its pre-existing appearance.
- 7.2.10 The pre-existing chimney to the dwelling was removed as part of unlawful works. It is proposed that a chimney is reinstated. This would be of similar character to that which was removed including a stock brick external finish and terracotta chimney pots. A photographic sample of this has been provided on the materials schedule. Subject to the proposed installation of a new chimney, as per the photographic sample and elevation drawings, the character and appearance of the dwelling would be preserved relative to its pre-existing appearance.
- 7.2.11 It is proposed that the ridge tiles and finials, that were removed from the dwelling, are reinstated with ones to match those removed. Photographic samples of these have been provided on the materials schedule. These would be installed to the main ridge and forward-facing gables of the dwelling, including the front bay window, porch, and dormer. Subject to the proposed installation of these features, as per the photographic samples and elevation drawings, the character and appearance of the dwelling would be preserved relative to its pre-existing appearance.
- 7.2.12 A further set of works to the dwelling include the construction of a new enclosed porch, with a gabled roof and new modern front door. This new porch also attaches to a garage conversion, which has a new pitched roof to the front, and new window in place of the garage door. It is noted that the new roof to the garage has replaced a somewhat unsympathetic flat roof. The loss of the garage door is acceptable in this regard. The loss of the pre-existing porch, which was an extremely characterful feature to the dwelling, has caused harm. The proposed retrospective changes include the reconstruction of the porch roof, including the reinstatement of decorative timber bargeboards and glazing above the door. As noted above, the finials and ridge tiles would be installed to the ridge of the porch. The current door would be replaced with a timber panelled door and side fenestration. This is more reflective of the pre-existing door, rather than the ultra-modern door currently in place. A photographic sample of the door is specified on the materials schedule. Further retrospective changes include the replacement of the concrete tiles to the mono-pitch over the garage with slate to match the roof. Subject to the proposed alterations to the front porch, as per the photographic sample and elevation drawings, the character and appearance of the dwelling would be preserved relative to its pre-existing appearance.
- 7.2.13 The proposed development includes seeking retrospective permission for a single-storey rear extension and associated raised patio. The extension has a depth of 4.5m, which does exceed the Design Criteria (within the Development Management Policies LDD Appendix 2) depth of 4.0m for detached dwelling. Notwithstanding, it is not considered that harm arises from its scale or disproportionality to the host dwelling. The extension contains a raised rear patio of relatively shallow depth and, again, harm is not considered to arise over the scale of this feature. The extension does have a modern appearance, when observed from the rear garden. Features contributing to this appearance include tall rear glazing, with black frames. The brickwork used for the extension is somewhat modern in appearance. The extension does have a simplified parapet roof and the brick surround to the glazing within the rear elevation somewhat lessens its overall visual impact. It is proposed that the rear extension is rendered in an off-white colour to match the rest of the dwelling.
- 7.2.14 It is noted that the Conservation Officer raises an objection to the rear extension, namely the depth, design and extent of glazing with modern black aluminium framing. There is

limited visibility of the extension from the public realm. There is also limited visibility from private vantage points within the Conservation Area. It is acknowledged that the two immediately adjoining neighbours to each side are likely to have a good view of the extension. There are several examples of deep rear extensions with flat roof forms within this Conservation Area. The extension is also proposed to be rendered in an off-white colour which would serve to soften its overall appearance and be more in keeping with the host dwelling, following the other proposed amendments. Taking all factors into account, on balance it is not considered that it would be justifiable to refuse planning permission for the extension based on its scale, design and fenestration.

- 7.2.15 A rooflight has been inserted within the rear facing roofslope of a first-floor side projection to the dwelling. This side projection pre-dates any planning history, however it does appear to be a later, ad-hoc addition to the property. The rooflight is not particularly visible from the public realm although some views of it may be available from private vantage points. It is not considered that this feature, in isolation, harms the character of the dwelling.
- 7.2.16 The pre-existing landscaping to the frontage has been removed and laid with gravel. It is noted that the Conservation Officer raises objection to the laying of gravel, stating that it has caused harm. Whilst it is acknowledged that hardstanding within the front gardens of properties resulting in a reduction in soft landscaping is seen as detracting from the character of the conservation area (para 5.16 of the Appraisal), given the immediate context and the size of the frontage, the gravel across the frontage is considered to preserve the character of the Conservation Area. A different conclusion may have been reached if the property was located further up Shire Lane as the character alters. On balance, considering that many dwellings throughout the immediate area have implemented fully paved driveways, it is not considered that the laying of gravel, in isolation, given the overall scale of the frontage causes harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 7.2.17 In summary, unauthorised works to the dwelling have resulted in its character and appearance, and its positive contribution to the Conservation Area, being harmfully eroded. This application includes remedial works to reinstate features with the aim of preserving its overall character and appearance relative to its pre-existing appearance. Officers consider that the amended plans have managed to achieve this objective. Any permission granted will include carefully worded conditions to ensure that these works are carried out, and in a set timeframe.
- 7.2.18 The proposed amended development would therefore preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in accordance with 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), Policies 1 and 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan (2020), the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area Appraisal (2005), and the NPPF (2024).

7.3 Impact on Neighbours

- 7.3.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should 'protect residential amenities by taking into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space'. Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not result in loss of light to the windows of neighbouring properties nor allow overlooking and should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties.
- 7.3.2 The proposed works to the front elevation of the application dwelling would not result in any adverse impact towards surrounding neighbouring amenity and are therefore considered acceptable in this regard.

- 7.3.3 The Design Criteria states that generally the maximum depth for rear extensions should be 4.0m in the case of detached dwellings. This distance may be reduced if the extension would adversely affect adjoining properties. Regarding Kelshall, the rear extension is built near the common boundary at its deepest point; however, there is a total separation distance of 3.0m between the host dwelling and Kelshall. Furthermore, this neighbouring property is positioned on a higher land level than the application site. Given the single storey design and modest height, it is not considered that the proposed rear extension results in undue harm to the residential amenities of Kelshall in terms of loss of light or appear overbearing.
- 7.3.4 With regards to Rosebank, this neighbouring property is a dental practice, nevertheless the rear extension is set off from the shared boundary by 1.3m with a total distance of 2.7m between the two properties. Although, Rosebank is on lower land level the design of the extension, coupled with the separation distance, means that it would not impact on the amenities of this neighbouring property.
- 7.3.5 The rear patio has created a raised platform. The raised patio is of a relatively modest depth and height and contains planters which limit the capabilities to stand right at the edges. Given that Kelshall is at a higher level it is not considered that any overlooking occurs. The patio provides some elevated views to the amenity garden of Rosebank however there is an inherent degree of overlooking anyway given the site levels. It is not considered that the proposed rear patio requires further screening to prevent impact upon neighbours.
- 7.3.6 The dormer built on site is not included on this proposal therefore its neighbour impact has not been assessed.
- 7.3.7 The proposed development is acceptable in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1, DM9 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD.

7.4 Traffic and Car Parking

- 7.4.1 Core Strategy Policy CP10 requires development to provide a safe and adequate means of access and to make adequate provision for all users, including car parking. Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies document set out parking standards.
- 7.4.2 There would be no alterations to the existing vehicular access to the property. In terms of car parking, as existing the dwelling contains four bedrooms, and the frontage provides one space. There is an existing shortfall of 2 off-street parking spaces. The works carried out have not increased the demand for parking in accordance with the adopted standards, and there would remain a shortfall of 2 spaces. It is noted that the driveway has been extended to accommodate 2 spaces, thereby reducing the total shortfall to 1 space. On street parking restrictions exist within the area which limit the availability of on-street parking. It is not considered that the shortfall in parking provision is sufficient to justify refusal of planning permission in this regard.
- 7.4.3 The proposal is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013).

7.5 Rear Garden Amenity Space

- 7.5.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should consider the need for adequate levels and disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity, and garden space.
- 7.5.2 The application dwelling would retain a rear amenity garden of over 200sqm in area which would exceed the policy requirement and would therefore be acceptable.

7.6 Trees

7.6.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy expects development proposals to 'have regard to the character, amenities and quality of an area', to 'conserve and enhance natural and heritage assets' and to 'ensure the development is adequately landscaped and is designed to retain, enhance or improve important existing natural features.' Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD advises that 'development proposals should demonstrate that existing trees, hedgerows, and woodlands will be safeguarded and managed during and after development in accordance with the relevant British Standard.

7.6.2 The application site is within the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area therefore all trees within are also afforded protection by this designation.

7.6.3 The proposed development has not impacted upon trees.

7.7 Biodiversity

7.7.1 Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 requires Local Planning Authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. This is further emphasised by regulation 3(4) of the Habitat Regulations 1994 which state that Councils must have regard to the strict protection for certain species required by the EC Habitats Directive. The Habitats Directive places a legal duty on all public bodies to have regard to the habitats directive when carrying out their functions.

7.7.2 The protection of biodiversity and protected species is a material planning consideration in the assessment of this application in accordance with Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies document. National Planning Policy requires Local Authorities to ensure that a protected species survey is undertaken for applications where biodiversity may be affected prior to the determination of a planning application. A Biodiversity Checklist was submitted with the application and states that no protected species or biodiversity interests will be affected because of the application.

7.8 Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain

7.8.1 Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 sets out that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the 'biodiversity gain condition' requiring development to achieve a net gain of 10% of biodiversity value. This is subject to exemptions, and an exemption applies in relation to planning permission for a development which is the subject of a householder application, within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order (2015).

7.8.2 The applicant has confirmed that if permission is granted for the development to which this application relates the biodiversity gain condition would not apply because the application relates to householder development. The LPA agree that Mandatory BNG would not apply in this instance.

8. **Recommendation**

That RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING PERMISSION be granted, subject to the following conditions:

C1 WITHIN SIX MONTHS from the date of this planning permission, the retrospective works, as set out in the development description and as shown on drawing number 00-02-00 (received 10.03.2026), shall be carried out in accordance with the

approved plan (and as per the requirements of Condition 2) and permanently maintained thereafter. For complete clarity, these retrospective works include:

- Alterations to the existing front windows to incorporate solid glazing bars.
- Construction of new chimney stack.
- Painting of existing render to specified off-white colour.
- Render to single-storey rear extension to match new colour.
- Installation of ridge tiles and finials.
- Reconstruction of roof of porch, including decorative bargeboards, glazing, and finials.
- Installation of slate roof to mono-pitched roof above garage.
- Install new front door and associated fenestration.
- Install decorative timber bargeboards.
- Alter rendered parts of front walls and piers to brick finish.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, in the proper interests of planning and to preserve the character and appearance of the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area, in accordance with 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), Policies 1 and 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan (2020), the Chorleywood Station Estate Conservation Area Appraisal (2005), and the NPPF (2024).

- C2 The development, hereby permitted, shall be carried out in accordance with the material details shown on the Materials Schedule (dated 10.03.2026). Any external finish material which departs from those stated on approved schedule will require submission to and approval from the Local Planning Authority.

Informatives

- I1 With regard to implementing this permission, the applicant is advised as follows:

All relevant planning conditions must be discharged prior to the commencement of work. Requests to discharge conditions must be made by formal application which includes a fee.

There may be a requirement for the approved development to comply with the Building Regulations. Please contact Hertfordshire Building Control (HBC) on 01438 879990 or at buildingcontrol@hertfordshirebc.co.uk who will be happy to advise you on building control matters and will protect your interests throughout your build project by leading the compliance process. Further information is available at www.hertfordshirebc.co.uk.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - Your development may be liable for CIL payments and you are advised to contact the CIL Officer for clarification with regard to this (cil@threerivers.gov.uk). If your development is CIL liable, even if you have been granted exemption from the levy, please be advised that before commencement of any works it is a requirement under Regulation 67 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (As Amended) that CIL form 6 (Commencement Notice) must be completed, returned and acknowledged by Three Rivers District Council before building works start. Failure to do so will mean you lose the right to payment by instalments (where applicable), and a surcharge will be imposed. However, please note that a Commencement Notice is not required for residential extensions IF relief has been granted.

Following the grant of planning permission by the Local Planning Authority it is accepted that new issues may arise post determination, which require modification

of the approved plans. Please note that regardless of the reason for these changes, where these modifications are fundamental or substantial, a new planning application will need to be submitted. Where less substantial changes are proposed, the following options are available to applicants:

{\b (a)} Making a Non-Material Amendment

{\b (b)} Amending the conditions attached to the planning permission, including seeking to make minor material amendments (otherwise known as a section 73 application).

It is important that any modifications to a planning permission are formalised before works commence otherwise your planning permission may be unlawful and therefore could be subject to enforcement action. In addition, please be aware that changes to a development previously granted by the LPA may affect any previous Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) owed or exemption granted by the Council. If you are in any doubt whether the new/amended development is now liable for CIL you are advised to contact the Community Infrastructure Levy Officer (01923 776611) for clarification. Information regarding CIL can be found on the Three Rivers website (<https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/services/planning/community-infrastructure-levy>).

Care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to ensure no damage occurs to the verge or footpaths during construction. Vehicles delivering materials to this development shall not override or cause damage to the public footway. Any damage will require to be made good to the satisfaction of the Council and at the applicant's expense.

Where possible, energy saving and water harvesting measures should be incorporated. Any external changes to the building which may be subsequently required should be discussed with the Council's Development Management Section prior to the commencement of work. Further information on how to incorporate changes to reduce your energy and water use is available at: <https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/services/environment-climate-emergency/home-energy-efficiency-sustainable-living#Greening%20your%20home>.

- I2 The applicant is reminded that the Control of Pollution Act 1974 allows local authorities to restrict construction activity (where work is audible at the site boundary). In Three Rivers such work audible at the site boundary, including deliveries to the site and running of equipment such as generators, should be restricted to 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- I3 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in its consideration of this planning application, in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The development maintains/improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the district.