
Planning Committee MINUTES

**Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth, on
Thursday, 16 July 2026 from 7.30 - 9.17 pm**

Present: Councillors Chris Whately-Smith (Chair), Elinor Gazzard, Oliver Cooper, Stephen Giles-Medhurst OBE, Chris Mitchell, Debbie Morris, Reena Ranger OBE and Tom Smith

Also in Attendance:

Councillor Ian Campbell, Councillor Vicky Edwards, Parish Councillor Guy Parks (Croxley Green Parish Council), Parish Councillor Jon Bishop (Chorleywood Parish Council) and Councillor Ciaràn Reed

Officers in Attendance:

Lauren Edwards, Principal Planning Officer
Emma Lund, Senior Committee Officer
Matthew Roberts, Development Management Team Leader
Kimberley Rowley, Head of Regulatory Services
Lilly Varnham, Senior Planning Officer

PC156/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Raj Khiroya and Stephen Cox.

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst replaced Councillor Raj Khiroya for this meeting only.

PC157/25 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 18 June 2026 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC158/25 NOTICE OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

PC159/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Reena Ranger declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 (26/0639/RSP – 38 Bedford Road, Moor Park, Northwood) as she lived within the neighbour consultation area for the application. Councillor Ranger left the meeting whilst the application was considered and did not participate in the debate or vote.

Councillor Chris Mitchell declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 9 (26/0678/FUL – 16A Cophorne Road, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth) as he was a friend of a resident of a

neighbouring property. Councillor Mitchell left the meeting whilst the application was considered and did not participate in the debate or vote.

PC160/25 25/1831/RSP - PART RETROSPECTIVE: CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FOR THE STATIONING OF CARAVANS FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES FOR 5 NO. GYPSY PITCHES (10 STATICS) INCLUDING FORMATION OF HARDSTANDING AND LANDSCAPING AT LITTLE LILY, TOMS LANE, KINGS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE WD4 8NJ

The application was part retrospective for change of use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes for 5 no. gypsy pitches (10 statics) including formation of hardstanding and landscaping at Little Lily, Toms Lane, Kings Langley.

For the benefit of the committee, the Planning Officer summarised that the application followed the grant of planning permission in 2025 for a change of use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes for five pitches with a brick-built day room. When assessed against national planning policy at the time, the development was considered to comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, there were Very Special Circumstances which led to its approval, subject to a personal condition to named individuals and their resident dependents. The principle of the use of the land as a traveller site had therefore already been established.

With regard to the current application, the site was no longer considered to be inappropriate in the Green Belt following the introduction of the December 2024 version of the NPPF. Instead, the site was considered to be Grey Belt whilst also meeting paragraph 155 of the NPPF. On this basis, the officer recommendation excluded the personal condition, as personal circumstances were no longer material to the acceptability of the scheme.

In terms of the differences between the previously permitted scheme and the current application, the Planning Officer clarified that there would be no increase in the number of pitches, which would remain at five. However, each pitch would no longer include one static caravan and one touring caravan, but instead two static caravans, with one providing residential accommodation and the other ancillary day room facilities. Accordingly, the previously permitted brick-built day room was no longer proposed as part of this application. In total the application sought to permit ten static caravans across the application site, equating to the five pitches as previously permitted, with recommended conditions to control the use and number of caravans.

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

- Concerns had been raised locally about both the number of caravans and the number of people who would be residing at the site. The Planning Officer confirmed that an existing enforcement case was open, and additionally that the site would likely be subject to ongoing monitoring by Environmental Health as part of the regular licencing arrangements for traveller sites. In the event that it was found during such a visit that residency or accommodation limits were being exceeded, then the recommended conditions would enable the local planning authority to serve breach of condition notices, against which there was no right to an appeal. The Planning Officer also commented that the site layout was constrained by the distances between the caravans themselves. Any additional caravans above the permitted number for the site would potentially breach fire safety regulations and result in enforcement action on the grounds of fire safety concerns.
- With regard to residents' concerns about noise and disturbance, the Planning Officer reported that these were matters which could be addressed by Environmental Health, rather than planning considerations.

- A Committee Member commented that the previous approval had been for five families, who would likely be quieter than groups of individuals. The Planning Officer responded that whilst the personal condition was no longer applicable, those residing at the site would still need to meet the definition for Gypsies and Travellers set out within the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and this was controlled by condition. No change was proposed to the number of pitches (5) which had already been approved. Additionally, Condition 4 sought to prevent and control any non-residential uses of the site.
- In response to a Committee Member's question about the potential for caravans to be sited very close to the back boundary with the nearest residential neighbour, and the potential for this to cause noise and disturbance to the neighbour, the Planning Officer clarified that boundary planting was proposed in order to mitigate privacy issues. Several Committee Members drew attention to the need to ensure that this planting scheme was implemented. However, with Gypsy and Traveller sites the permission arguably related to use of the land, and so the static caravans would be able to be re-positioned or re-orientated within the site. However, should there be any attempt to move too many of the caravans close to the boundary this would contravene fire regulations (which required the caravans to be kept at least 6m apart), and probably also the site licence. In response to a further question, the Planning Officer confirmed that a requirement to submit details of the boundary planting (principally in relation to the north-western boundary with the nearest residential neighbour) could be conditioned.
- A Committee Member raised concerns about the over-intensification of the site and expressed the view that the provision of 10 static caravans would result in greater occupancy than would the case with one static caravan and one touring caravan per pitch, and additionally that the static caravans may be used to accommodate more people than was intended. The Committee Member stated that the site had already been subject to significant environmental health problems, including a rat infestation due to the failure to dispose of rubbish, and site access issues, both of which would be exacerbated by the over-intensification. Additionally, removing the touring caravans in favour of static caravans represented a move away from the principles and rules for gypsy and traveller sites and would make future control of the use of the site more difficult. The Committee Member also commented that whilst the weight given to the emerging local plan was limited, it set out that the size and scale of gypsy and traveller sites (either alone or in combination with other sites) should respect the size and density of the local settled community and not be dominant, which was not considered to be the case with this application.
- The Planning Officer responded that there was potential to condition bin storage and waste management on site and to require the placement of bins away from residential boundaries to facilitate collection by waste management services. However, the application needed to be determined according to what was proposed and not what might (or might not) happen. It was suggested that the wording of Condition C2 could be tightened to require 'no more than 5 caravans to be *solely* used as primary living accommodation and no more than 5 caravans to be used *solely* to accommodate ancillary day room facilities.' The Planning Officer also highlighted that there was a control in the fact that should the static caravans which were provided for day amenity instead be used for residential accommodation then the site would lack sufficient amenity, rendering the accommodation level sub-standard. In further debate it was suggested that the condition should refer only to accommodation (not 'primary accommodation') and that the reason for the condition should clarify why the day amenity provision was required.
- A number of Committee Members highlighted the need to restrict the over-use of the site. Concerns were also raised with regard to the use of large vehicles at the site, parking arrangements, and the potential disruption and loss of amenity to neighbouring residents arising from noise. In response to a question, the Planning Officer confirmed that an emergency vehicle access route would be required to be provided under the terms of the site licence.

- A Committee Member expressed the view that unless the development addressed unmet need it would not be appropriate development in the Green Belt. The issue of whether or not the proposal would meet unmet development need was therefore key. Given that the emerging Local Plan had identified sufficient pitches across the district to meet the existing need, it was not considered that the additional caravans proposed within this application were required and therefore that it represented over-intensification. In response, the Planning Officer reported that officers were of the opinion that the site was Grey Belt and met the tests at Paragraph 155 of the NPPF. Additionally, as the emerging Local Plan had not yet reached the Regulation 19 stage and there was no clarity about when it would be adopted, there was still unmet need on the basis of the current evidence base. This view had been supported by recent appeal decisions.

Councillor Giles-Medhurst moved, and Councillor Mitchell seconded, that the application be refused due to the impact on neighbouring amenity and impacts on visual amenity of the area through the intensification of additional static caravans across the site in conjunction with associated paraphernalia and activities, a lack of soft landscaping and poor waste management.

Councillor Cooper moved that the reasons for refusal should also include that the proposal was inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it did not meet unmet need. This was not accepted by the mover of the substantive motion on the basis that the proposal did not change the existing capacity of the site. The amendment was not seconded and therefore fell.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused due to the impact on neighbouring amenity and impacts on visual amenity of the area through the intensification of additional static caravans across the site in conjunction with associated paraphernalia and activities, a lack of soft landscaping and poor waste management.

PC161/25 26/0377/LBC - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING K6 TELEPHONE KIOSK INCLUDING MINOR REPAIRS, REPLACEMENT OF GLAZING, REINSTATEMENT OF MISSING SIGNAGE, INSTALLATION OF REMOVABLE TRANSPARENT STAINED-GLASS-EFFECT COMMUNITY ARTWORK PANEL TO THE INTERNAL FACE OF GLAZING AT K6 TELEPHONE KIOSK, OPPOSITE ALL SAINTS CHURCH, CROXLEY GREEN, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 3AN

The application was for listed building consent for refurbishment of existing K6 telephone kiosk including minor repairs, replacement of glazing, reinstatement of missing signage, installation of removable transparent stained-glass-effect community artwork panel to the internal face of glazing at K6 Telephone Kiosk, Opposite All Saints Church, Croxley Green.

There was no officer update.

Parish Councillor Guy Parks of Croxley Green Parish Council spoke in favour of the application.

Points raised by the speaker included that the proposal, which had been produced by members of Croxley Green Parish Youth Council who had been involved with all aspects of its inception and development, would re-purpose the telephone kiosk as a community art installation; the project had given youth council members valuable experience of local democracy, heritage conservation and project management, while enabling them to make a lasting contribution to their community; a community art competition would be held following the restoration of the kiosk inviting local children and young people to create stained glass inspired designs celebrating the heritage, landscape and culture of Croxley Green; the

proposal would enable the unused asset to be transformed into an attractive and welcoming landmark; and the installation would be entirely reversible, ensuring no harm to the Grade 2 listed asset and allowing future generations to refresh the artwork.

Committee Members were supportive of the proposal, which was considered to be a worthwhile project which would bring a welcome new purpose to the asset.

Councillor Mitchell moved, and Councillor Ranger 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.

PC162/25 26/0537/FUL – CONSTRUCTION OF PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION; INSTALLATION OF WINDOWS TO SIDE ELEVATION AT 63 WATFORD ROAD, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 3DS

The application was for construction of a part single, part two storey front and side extension, single storey rear extension, and installation of windows to side elevation at 63 Watford Road, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth.

There was no officer update.

Parish Councillor Guy Parks of Croxley Green Parish Council spoke against the application.

Points raised by the speaker included: the old crossover had not been removed and was still in use in addition to the new crossover. Therefore, there had been a change to parking arrangements which was not reflected in the application; by bringing the extension right up to, or within 300m of, the boundary with a new blank elevation with only one upper window to a habitable room, the wide aspect and original harmonious street scene of Dickinson Square would be lost; the setback and wide aspect should be retained and the house should continue to have windows facing Dickinson Square; and extensions to the house could be carried out in other less aesthetically damaging ways further back from the pavement.

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

- In response to the comment made by the speaker about the status of the original crossover, a Committee Member commented that the Highways Authority had raised the dropped kerb and therefore it had potentially been included in the plans in error. The Planning Officer clarified that the acceptability of the scheme was not dependent on the removal or closing up of the dropped kerb.
- It was noted that the Conservation Officer had no objection to the proposal.

Councillor Morris moved, and Councillor Whately-Smith seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 6 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

PC163/25 26/0639/RSP – PART RETROSPECTIVE: CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO CREATE A GARAGE, AND INSTALLATION OF SOLAR

PANELS AT 38 BEDFORD ROAD, MOOR PARK, NORTHWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE HA6 2AZ

Councillor Ranger left the meeting.

The application was part retrospective for construction of a single storey side extension to create a garage, and installation of solar panels at 38 Bedford Road, Moor Park, Northwood.

There was no officer update.

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

- A Committee Member commented on the design of the existing gates, which were not considered to be aesthetically pleasing, although it was acknowledged that they did not form part of the application under consideration and were lawful.
- A Committee Member highlighted that the addition of the garage would result in a plot width coverage 87.5%, as opposed to the 80% maximum set out in the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal. Additionally, the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal stipulated that there should be a 1.5m gap between the closest edge of the structure and the boundary, whereas in this application it was significantly less than that. The Planning Officer confirmed that the Conservation Officer had no objection to the proposal.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor Cooper seconded, that part-retrospective planning permission be granted subject to conditions. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 6 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

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

Councillor Ranger re-joined the meeting.

PC164/25 26/0678/FUL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND OUTBUILDING, CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSIONS; SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS; OMISSION OF REAR BALCONIES AND REPLACEMENT WITH REAR JULIET BALCONIES, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION; ALTERATIONS TO DRIVEWAY; EXTENSION OF REAR PATIO AREA; ALTERATION OF EXTERNAL MATERIALS INCLUDING RENDER AND CLADDING; ALTERATION OF FRONT ENTRANCE AT 16A COPTHORNE ROAD, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 4AE

Councillor Mitchell left the meeting.

The application was for demolition of existing garage and outbuilding, construction of two storey front and side extensions; single storey side and rear extensions; omission of rear balconies and replacement with rear Juliet balconies, internal alterations and alterations to fenestration; alterations to driveway; extension of rear patio area; alteration of external materials including render and cladding; alteration of front entrance at 16A Copthorne Road, Croxley Green, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer provided an update that following publication of the report, officers had undertaken a site visit to the neighbouring property, 18A Copthorne Road, in order to further review the relationship between the application site and the neighbouring property. Observations from the visit had been considered, and officers were satisfied that the assessment and conclusions as set out in the report remained unchanged.

A neighbouring resident spoke against the application.

Parish Councillor Guy Parks of Croxley Green Parish Council spoke on the application.

Points raised by speakers against the proposal included: there would be a harmful impact on the neighbouring property in terms of reduction in daylight, unbalanced mass, outlook, openness and a sense of enclosure; there had been no BRE daylight assessment, sunlight study or other quantitative analysis; and there was a lack of evidence to demonstrate that the harmful impacts which had been identified were no longer harmful following the amendments made during the course of the application.

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

- In response to points raised by speakers, the Planning Officer reported that whilst concerns had been raised at the pre-application stage with regards to depth, height and spacing to the boundary, it was the view of officers that these concerns had been addressed through the amended plans received during the course of the application. The height of the single storey rear extension had been reduced, and the two storey built form was set down from the ridge with the first floor being set back from the ground floor footprint. Officers acknowledged that the proposal would be visible from habitable windows of the neighbouring property. However, two of the affected rooms benefitted from dual aspects being at the ground floor, which reduced the reliance on the outlook in the direction of the proposed extension. The remaining window served a room identified as an office / bedroom. Whilst the proposal would inevitably introduce some additional built form into the outlook from this window, having regard to the separation distance set down from the ridge and the overall scale and design of the extension, officers did not consider that the visual impact would be so significant as to result to unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
- The Planning Officer clarified that the c1.5m gap to the flank boundary with 18A was in excess of the Council's design criteria and also confirmed that a 45 degree assessment had been made as set out in section 7.2.7 of the report.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor Gazzard seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 4 in favour, 0 against, 3 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

PC165/25 ITEM WITHDRAWN 26/0692/FUL - REMOVAL OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND, CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE/REAR EXTENSION, REMOVAL OF CHIMNEYS; ALTERATION TO FENESTRATION INCLUDING RELOCATION OF ENTRANCE DOOR, EXTERNAL MATERIALS INCLUDING RENDER AT 42 MARLIN SQUARE, ABBOTS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE WD5 0EG

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

CHAIR