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 Thursday, 22 October 2026 from 7.00 - 9.59 pm

Present: Councillors Chris Whately-Smith (Chair), Elinor Gazzard, Oliver Cooper, Stephen Cox, Chris Mitchell, Debbie Morris, Tom Smith, Louise Price and Krutika Patel

Also in Attendance:

Councillor Aidan Bentley, Councillor Vicky Edwards, Councillor Jon Tankard, Parish Councillor Andrew Gallagher (Croxley Green Parish Council), Parish Councillor Elizabeth Willetts (Batchworth Community Council) and County Councillor Vishal Patel

Officers in Attendance:

Matthew Barnes, Principal Lawyer - Planning
Alex Laurie, Principal Trees and Woodlands Officer
Emma Lund, Senior Committee Officer
Suzanne O'Brien, Principal Planning Officer
Adam Ralton, Development Management Team Leader
Kimberley Rowley, Head of Regulatory Services
Scott Volker, Development Management Team Leader

PC180/26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Raj Khiroya and Reena Ranger. The substitutes were Councillors Louise Price and Krutika Patel respectively.

PC181/26 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10 September 2026 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PC182/26 NOTICE OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

PC183/26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Liberal Democrat Group declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 15 (26/1253/FUL – 42 Marlin Square, Abbots Langley) as the agent is a member of the authority and a member of the Liberal Democrat Group.

Councillor Gazzard declared that she was a ward councillor for the application at agenda item 17 (26/1321/RSP - 10 Hyde Lane, Nash Mills, Hemel Hempstead) and intended to speak against the application in this capacity if the item was reached at the meeting. Having formed a view on the application, Councillor Gazzard would not participate in determining it.

PC184/26 CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 938 (PENFOLD PARK GOLF CLUB, ST ALBANS ROAD) 2026

The Committee was invited to consider confirmation of Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 938 (Penfold Park Golf Club, St Albans Road).

The Principal Trees and Woodlands Officer reported that the Order had been served on 11 June 2026 in response to concerns raised by ward councillors and residents about the risk of pre-development clearance, as the location was included in the site allocations in the emerging Local Plan. The TPO was an area order which was specifically designed to provide temporary protection for trees and deter clearance work. Once any development for the site was agreed, the intention was that the area order would be replaced with a more specific TPO which protected individual trees and tree groups.

In response to the serving of the TPO, one letter of objection and one letter of support had been received.

The objection cited that it was not expedient to make the order and the council had made no assessment of this; that no assessment of the amenity value of the trees had been made and the trees do not have sufficient amenity value to warrant protection; that council officers did not engage with the landowner prior to serving the TPO and did not visit the site to view the trees; and that the use of an area order was not justified as the situation was not an emergency.

Officers' response was that the site was included in the emerging local plan for housing, but the trees had no protection to prevent their removal. The trees could be clearly viewed from several public vantage points, and officers had visited the site on two occasions to assess the trees from the public realm. It was not usual to consult tree owners prior to serving a TPO, as this may provide the opportunity for trees to be removed before they are protected; and finally, government guidance advised that there did not need to be an immediate risk to trees to justify the serving of a TPO, particularly where there may be pressure from development.

The letter of support had cited a number of reasons why the order should be confirmed, including the benefits of reduction in air and noise pollution; biodiversity benefits; and benefit to public amenity and screening, climate resilience and flood management.

The officer recommendation was that the TPO should be confirmed.

The Chair summarised that two options were available to the committee. Option one was to confirm the order and make TPO 938 permanent. In the future, were the site to be developed, a new specific TPO would be served to protect individual and/or groups of trees which were to be retained. Option two was to not confirm the order and allow it to lapse. This would result in the majority of trees in Area 1 ceasing to be protected.

For the reasons set out above and contained in the report Committee Members supported the confirmation of TPO 938.

Councillor Whately-Smith moved, and Councillor Cooper seconded, that TPO 938 (Penfold Park Golf Club, St Albans Road) be confirmed. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That TPO 938 (Penfold Park Golf Club, St Albans Road) be confirmed.

PC185/26 25/0563/RSP - PART RETROSPECTIVE: CREATION OF VEHICLE PARKING AREAS FOR COMPANY VEHICLES INCLUDING ALTERATIONS TO LAND LEVELS AND ASSOCIATED BOUNDARY TREATMENT HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, ATTENUATION BASIN, LIGHTING; THE USE OF THE EXISTING BUNGALOW AS OFFICES INCLUDING LOFT CONVERSION WITH DORMERS AND ROOFLIGHTS; AND DEMOLITION OF STABLES AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO-STOREY BUILDING FOR OFFICE / TRAINING / VEHICLE MAINTENANCE PREMISES (USE CLASS SUI GENERIS) AT THE PADDOCK, LITTLE OXHEY LANE, CARPENDERS PARK, WATFORD WD19 5BA

The application was part retrospective for creation of vehicle parking areas for company vehicles including alterations to land levels and associated boundary treatment hard and soft landscaping, attenuation basin, lighting; the use of the existing bungalow as offices including loft conversion with dormers and rooflights; and demolition of stables and construction of two-storey building for office / training / vehicle maintenance premises (Use Class Sui Generis) at The Paddock, Little Oxhey Lane, Carpenders Park, Watford.

The Planning Officer reported that a correction was required to Condition 2 to update a drawing number. Additionally, a representation of support from the South West Herts Coalition had been received since the publication of the agenda but did not change the officers' recommendation.

County Councillor Vishal Patel spoke on the application.

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

Points raised by the speaker against the application included: harm to openness and loss of Green Belt which was not outweighed by the public benefit; the proposal was inappropriate development which would permanently urbanise the Green Belt and weaken its role in preventing encroachment; and the proposal would risk the site being used in future for significant housing development.

Points raised by the speaker in favour of the application included: the proposal would enable the applicant to meet a growing demand for transport for children with special educational needs and vulnerable adults, including providing a training centre for staff and facilities to maintain vehicles on site; very special circumstances had already been established for the business to occupy the site; the new building would cut carbon emissions by a level significantly in excess of policy requirements; the proposal provided a benefit to the local economy through the provision of jobs; and the application would deliver a new footway and a crossing on Little Oxhey Lane.

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

- A Committee Member commented that Policy GB7(g) of the NPPF required development on Grey Belt land to also evidence unmet need for the type of development proposed, in order to not be considered as inappropriate in the Green Belt. It was therefore important to establish whether the harm to the Green Belt was proportionate to the need, and also where the locality of that need was. The Planning Officer responded that officers considered there was evidence of demonstrable unmet need across the district and countywide for specialist day transport, for the reasons set out at paragraph 7.2.13 of the report. This was also reflected in HCC's published figures for children in need of specialist day transport which showed an increasing demand for the service which was expected to continue to grow. The business operators at the site had also stated that they had been unable to bid for transport contracts due to a lack of space, further indicating unmet need.

- A Committee Member questioned whether additional space might be found elsewhere in the county in order to meet need which was more local to those areas, rather than building on the district's metropolitan Green Belt to address demand which came from outside Three Rivers and its immediate area. Another Committee Member commented that this approach could risk the operator moving to a larger site elsewhere and ceasing to operate from the site completely, which would negatively impact the social and economic benefits currently provided within the community.

- In response to a question from a Committee Member, the Planning Officer confirmed agreement that the circumstances which had been outlined in a representation circulated by the applicant to Committee Members did represent very special circumstances.

- A Committee Member recommended amendment to Condition 14 to require the proposed building to be used only in accordance with the business operating on site, in order to prevent sub-letting or use by other organisations. Officers agreed to circulate proposed revised wording for the condition after the meeting.

- Some Committee Members considered that the unmet need claimed by the applicant had not been sufficiently evidenced or evidenced as being local to Three Rivers. It was suggested that the application might be deferred to allow more information to be obtained. However, in debate Committee Members considered that very special circumstances had nonetheless been demonstrated and therefore that approval should be granted.

Councillor Gazzard moved, and Councillor Mitchell seconded, that part retrospective planning permission be granted subject to conditions; an update to Condition 2 to correct a drawing number; and amendment to Condition 14 to require the proposed building to be used only in accordance with the business operating on the site. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That part retrospective planning permission be granted subject to conditions; an update to Condition 2 to correct a drawing number; and amendment to Condition 14 to require the proposed building to be used only in accordance with the business operating on the site.

PC186/26 25/2168/OUT - OUTLINE APPLICATION: CONSTRUCTION OF UP TO 70 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3) WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS ONTO OXHEY LANE AND INFRASTRUCTURE (APPEARANCE, LAYOUT, LANDSCAPING AND SCALE AS RESERVED MATTERS) AT LAND ADJACENT TO WOODLANDS COTTAGE, OXHEY LANE, CARPENDERS PARK, WATFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE

The application was outline for construction of up to 70 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated access onto Oxhey Lane and infrastructure (Appearance, Layout, Landscaping and Scale as reserved matters) at Land Adjacent to Woodlands Cottage, Oxhey Lane, Carpenders Park, Watford.

The Planning Officer clarified that the application was before the Committee again (following a previous resolution of refusal in August 2026, a few days after the 2026 National Planning Policy Framework update) as officers had subsequently sought external advice in relation to the merits of the application.

Following this advice the scheme had been comprehensively re-assessed against the new updated NPPF, and the application was being brought back for further consideration by the Committee.

The Planning Officer reported that two further objections had been received following publication of the report. One of these had raised matters which were already addressed in the report. The second had raised objections to the contents of the report, suggesting that it

represented a misreading of the 2026 NPPF. This letter had been uploaded to the planning portal and circulated to Committee Members. In response the Planning Officer confirmed that officers had taken full consideration of the 2026 NPPF in reaching the recommendation to approve the application and did not agree that it rested on a misreading of the national policy.

County Councillor Vishal Patel spoke on the application.

A representative of the South West Herts Coalition spoke against the application.

Concerns raised by speakers against the application included: harm to the Green Belt; heritage impact; the absence of completed section 106 agreement to secure an infrastructure contribution to address local pressures on schools, healthcare and drainage; the officers' assessment that the site did not strongly serve the relevant Green Belt purpose was too narrow; there would be harm to the setting of the Grade II listed Oxhey Grange and Lodge, and potential impact on the Watford Heath Conservation Area, which would not be outweighed by the public benefit and this should be given significant weight; there was insufficient capacity in the road network and local services to support the development; there was a lack of compliance with the NPPF benchmark in relation to the distance from Bushey Station; the site was not sustainable; and the cumulative impact of a number of developments within a small area should be considered.

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

- In response to a question, the Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal was unchanged from that which had been considered by the Committee in August. There was therefore nothing new which sought to address the reasons for refusal given by the Committee. Rather, it was the assessment of the application in relation to the updated NPPF, and whether the reasons for refusal could be justified, which required further consideration by the Committee. This included whether the public benefits of the scheme outweighed the low level of harm identified by the Conservation Officer to the setting of the Grade II listed Oxhey Grange. Officers were firmly of the view that the application should be approved, and the advice which had been sought strongly indicated that any appeal against refusal would be very difficult to defend.

- Responding to a point raised by a speaker about the distance from Bushey Station, which had also been discussed by the Committee at the August meeting, the Planning Officer confirmed that the site was considered to be within reasonable walking distance of the station. However, officers considered the site to be Grey Belt which fell within policy GB(7)(g). This required a different assessment in relation to site sustainability, set out in policy TR3 of the NPPF, which did not reference reasonable walking distance.

- A Committee Member commented that some other local planning authorities had reached the conclusion that Carpenders Park was a town. It was questioned whether Committee Members might take the same view and therefore consider that the proposal would breach Purpose B of the Green Belt. The Planning Officer responded that as set out at paragraph 7.2.24, officers considered that even if Carpenders Park and South Oxhey were considered to be towns, the site did not form part of a substantial gap between Watford and Carpenders Park and the development would not result in the loss of visual separation of towns. Members would therefore need to clearly justify why the site was considered to strongly contribute towards the purpose of preventing neighbouring towns from merging, taking account of all of the elements of Annex E and whether the site's contribution was weak, moderate or strong in terms of that assessment. Officers also expressed the view that determination of the application should be based on the Council's own Local Plan and evidence base rather than those of other authorities.

- Some Committee Members expressed regret that the proposal would result in the site being taken out of the Green Belt and supported it reluctantly, acknowledging that that

there were not sufficient reasons to justify refusal on planning grounds given the lack of objection from statutory consultees, the Conservation Officer's conclusion that the level of harm would be low, and the policies within the new NPPF.

- A Committee Member recommended that officers should seek to ensure that the proposed buildings were of as high a standard as possible in relation to energy efficiency at the reserved matters stage, and that an informative should be added to this effect.

Councillor Price moved, and Councillor Whately-Smith seconded, that an informative be added to encourage the applicant to maximise the energy efficiency of the proposed buildings; and that authority be delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission, following completion of a S106 Agreement (securing the Heads of Terms set out at section 7.20 of the report including affordable housing provision, travel plan, contributions to infrastructure including education, healthcare and waste infrastructure and monitoring fees) subject to conditions and to make any minor amendments to the Heads of Terms and Planning Conditions in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair.

On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 5 for, 3 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

That an informative be added to encourage the applicant to maximise the energy efficiency of the proposed buildings; and that authority be delegated to the Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission, following completion of a S106 Agreement (securing the Heads of Terms set out at section 7.20 of the report including affordable housing provision, travel plan, contributions to infrastructure including education, healthcare and waste infrastructure and monitoring fees) subject to conditions and to make any minor amendments to the Heads of Terms and Planning Conditions in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair.

PC187/26 26/0331/FUL – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING WORKSHOPS AND CONSTRUCTION OF A TWO-STOREY BUILDING CONTAINING 4 RESIDENTIAL UNITS (USE CLASS C3) WITH ACCOMMODATION IN THE ROOF SERVED BY FRONT DORMERS, SIDE/REAR ROOFLIGHTS, SOLAR PANELS, ALTERATIONS TO VEHICULAR ACCESS, WITH ASSOCIATED CAR AND BIKE PARKING, REFUSE AND RECYCLING STORAGE, LANDSCAPING WORKS AT GREYSTONE WORKS, THE GREEN, CROXLEY GREEN, HERTFORDSHIRE

The application was for demolition of existing workshops and construction of a two-storey building containing 4 residential units (Use Class C3) with accommodation in the roof served by front dormers, side/rear rooflights, solar panels, alterations to vehicular access, with associated car and bike parking, refuse and recycling storage, landscaping works at Greystone Works, The Green, Croxley Green.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates but clarified that the proposal largely represented a re-submission of a previously approved scheme dating back to 2019/20 which had lapsed. The only physical difference to the approved scheme was the relocation of one parking space away from the northern boundary in order to ensure improved highway visibility, as requested by Hertfordshire County Council.

The only other change to the approved scheme related to affordable housing. In 2019 the scheme had been subject to a contribution for affordable housing; however, due to the increase in benchmark land value and build costs in the intervening the scheme was no longer viable to contribute towards affordable housing.

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

Concerns raised included a lack of car parking space on the local roads; the impact on neighbours' gardens by overlooking; blocking of views from the flats above the shops;

inappropriate and incongruous design and overbearing scale which would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area; and a lack of compliance with policy CA1 of the Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan.

A Committee Member supported points made by the speaker from the Parish Council, expressing the view that the proposal represented over-development of what was a very small site. However, other Committee Members considered that the only material change to the previously approved scheme was minor, that the Committee was bound by its previous decision, and that there was a demonstrable need for housing and for these reasons should be accepted, noting that the proposal was also recommended for approval by officers.

Another Committee Member commented that whilst it was not a material planning consideration, it was regrettable that the Council had lost the contribution towards affordable housing which had been required under the original grant of permission due to the applicant not having implemented the scheme.

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 8 for, 1 against and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

PC188/26 26/0645/FUL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH; CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING ALTERATIONS TO ROOF FORM, WITH FRONT/REAR DORMERS, REAR JULIET DORMER AND FRONT/SIDE ROOFLIGHTS; INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION AT 75 NIGHTINGALE ROAD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 7BU

The application was for demolition of existing two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front porch; construction of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension, loft conversion including alterations to roof form, with front/rear dormers, rear Juliet dormer and front/side rooflights; internal alterations and alterations to fenestration at 75 Nightingale Road, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates but reminded Committee Members that the application had been deferred at the August meeting to allow the applicant to consider amendments to the scheme in response to concerns expressed by Committee Members. These principally related to setting the two-storey side extension further from the boundary with No. 73 Nightingale Road, overcoming the Conservation Officer's outstanding objection in respect of the number of rooflights and the size of the dormer windows, and a clarification as to which room the flank window in the neighbouring dwelling served. Officers had discussed these issues with the applicant; however, no amendments to the scheme had been proposed. The report had also been updated to reflect the revised NPPF.

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

- A Committee Member commented that one of the concerns previously raised had related to the outlook from the first floor side window of number 73. As it had now been clarified that this window served a bathroom and was obscure glazed, this concern had been allayed.

- Another Committee Member expressed the view that whilst it was regrettable that the applicant had not made changes in response to Committee Members' concerns, there were no other material planning considerations to counter the opinion that the proposal would,

on balance, make a positive contribution in comparison to the current building in terms of preserving and enhancing the Conservation Area.

Councillor Cooper moved, and Councillor Simth seconded, that planning permission be granted subject to conditions. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

PC189/26 26/0907/FUL – CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FOR USE AS A RESIDENTIAL CARAVAN SITE COMPRISING 2NO. GYPSY/TRAVELLER PITCHES, EACH ACCOMMODATING 4 CARAVANS INCLUDING NO MORE THAN 2 STATIC CARAVAN/MOBILE HOMES, WITH ASSOCIATED HARDSTANDING, ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS AND ERECTION OF TWO AMENITY BUILDINGS AND BOUNDARY TREATMENTS INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION OF TIMBER POST AND RAIL FENCING AT LAND SOUTH OF HARTHALL LANE, KINGS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE

The application was for change of use of land for use as a residential caravan site comprising 2no. Gypsy/Traveller pitches, each accommodating 2 caravans including no more than 2 static caravan/mobile homes, with associated hardstanding, alterations to access and erection of two amenity buildings and boundary treatments including construction of timber post and rail fencing at Land South of Harthall Lane, Kings Langley.

The Planning Officer reported that a correction was required to the description of the development as shown at the top of the report, to reflect that the proposal was for change of use of land for use as a residential caravan site comprising 2no. Gypsy/Traveller pitches, each accommodating 2 caravans (not 4).

The Planning Officer also demonstrated, by use of the block plan, how the various measurements given in the report related to different parts of the site.

Parish Councillor Jon Tankard of Abbots Langley Parish Council spoke on the application.

A local resident spoke against the application.

Points raised by speakers included concern that the site was not in a sustainable location; density of traveller sites in the Toms Lane area, as well as elsewhere in Kings Langley, Bedmond and Langleybury; the site should be classified as Green Belt and not Grey Belt, and forms part of the parcel of land that stops Hemel Hempstead and the built-up area of Watford from merging; there is no footpath nor any public transport links for a significant distance; and the development does not meet a demonstrable unmet need as the new Local Plan allocates sufficient sites for gypsy pitches.

In response to points raised about the sustainability of the site location, the Planning Officer clarified that paragraph 7.2.22 of the report set out the requirement to have regard to footnote 42 and policy HO12 of the NPPF when assessing development involving the provision of traveller sites, in addition to policy TR3. The Planning Officer summarised the assessment of the application against these requirements as set out at paragraphs 7.2.22 to 7.2.28 of the report. This assessment had led to the officers' conclusion that the application site was in a sustainable location for gypsy and traveller pitches.

In response to points raised about reported issues at other gypsy and traveller sites in the district, some of which had resulted in enforcement action, the Planning Officer highlighted that this was not a material planning consideration and that the application must be determined on its own merits.

In response to other points raised by speakers, the Planning Officer clarified that the need for pitches was addressed in the report. Officers were of the view that there was demonstrable unmet need, for the reasons set out in the report. The reasons why the application site was not considered to strongly contribute to purposes A, B and D and the reasons for the officers' assessment of the site as Grey Belt were also set out in the report. Additionally, the argument that the site contributed towards preventing Hemel Hempstead and the built-up area of Watford from merging did not, in the Planning Officer's professional view, have merit in light of the distances involved.

The Planning Officer also clarified that whilst the emerging Local Plan was at Regulation 19 stage and some weight was being given to its policies, it had not undergone examination and the application ultimately had to be determined in accordance with the current planning policy and NPPF as detailed in the report.

In response to a further question about sustainability, it was acknowledged that if relying on a car the nearest settlements and facilities were about a 5 minute (or one and a half mile) drive away. However, the Planning Officer drew attention to a recent appeal decision relating to a similar site in Bucks Hill where the Planning Inspector had found that the site, which was a similar drive and a similar quality of walk to other settlements and local facilities, was in a sustainable location. Some Committee Members did not agree that the location was sustainable, citing the fact that the development would be car dependent and walking routes were poor.

Councillor Cox moved, and Councillor Smith seconded, that the application be approved subject to conditions and correction to the description of the development. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 5 for 3 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to conditions and correction to the description of the development.

PC190/26 26/0909/FUL – CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AT 62 STATION ROAD, KINGS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD4 8LB

The application was for construction of single storey side extension at 62 Station Road, Kings Langley.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates.

Parish Councillor Jon Tankard of Abbots Langley Parish Council spoke on the application.

Councillor Bentley spoke on the application.

A local resident spoke against the application.

Points raised by speakers included: the proposal would result in over-development of the site and harm to nearby listed buildings and the character and appearance of the area; the proposal would result in a parking shortfall in an area where parking was already very constrained; there would be no legal or safe access to the garage from the public highway and a crossover would not be permitted due to the site's location which was close to a corner and bus stop with a lack of sufficient visibility; and the proposal would result in a loss of outdoor amenity space and negatively impact on hedgerows and biodiversity.

In responding to the points raised by speakers the Planning Officer confirmed that no restrictions were being sought on the use of the room, which was labelled as a garage. However, if Members were concerned then a planning condition could be attached requiring its use to be incidental to the main building. The building was shown on both the existing and

proposed set of plans as a house in multiple occupation for six occupants. Planning permission would be required in the event that the new space were to be used as a seventh bedroom, as it would allow a seventh occupant.

The Planning Officer also advised that refusal based on safety concerns relating to vehicular access would be difficult to justify, as the application was for a side extension only with no changes to the vehicular access. There was therefore nothing within the proposal which was inherently unsafe. In relation to parking, whilst it was acknowledged that there was a parking shortfall, there was nothing within the application which would worsen the existing shortfall.

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

- Committee Members supported the addition of a condition to restrict the use of the room in the event of any grant of permission.

- A Committee Member noted that a previous application at the site had been refused by the Planning Committee on the grounds of over-development and loss of amenity space and questioned why officers considered this proposal to be acceptable. The Planning Officer responded that the previous application had been materially different in that it was for a larger, two storey extension with a larger footprint. However, that refusal had been contrary to the officer recommendation. Officers did not consider that sufficient harm to justify refusal could be demonstrated in relation to this application. Some Committee Members disagreed, considering that the application was unacceptable for the same reasons as the refusal of the earlier application. Whilst this application was for a smaller extension, there had been a significant amount of development at the site under permitted development in the interim (principally, a single story rear extension and loft conversion) meaning that this proposal would result in cramped over-development.

- In response to a Member's question the Planning Officer clarified that if the application were approved then the applicant would be likely to have exhausted permitted development rights at the property. However, if the application were refused, a single storey side extension and additional outbuildings might be possible under permitted development, subject to meeting the relevant criteria. Removal of permitted development rights for outbuildings was proposed as a condition of this application in order to prevent further reduction in amenity space.

- In response to a question, the Planning Officer confirmed that officers did not consider the extension to be excessively prominent, and that it was considered to be subordinate to the house and not obtrusive to the street scene. There was also not considered to be any harm to the heritage cottages opposite the site due to the separation distance.

Councillor Morris moved, and Councillor Cooper seconded, that the application be refused by reason of the shortfall in car parking spaces which was in breach of the car parking standard and design criteria, and shortfall in outdoor amenity space resulting in cramped over-development of the site harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Full wording of the reasons for refusal to be circulated following the meeting.

On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 6 for, 0 against and 3 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused by reason of the shortfall in car parking spaces which was in breach of the car parking standard and design criteria, and shortfall in outdoor amenity space resulting in cramped over-development of the site harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Full wording of the reasons for refusal to be circulated following the meeting.

PC191/26 26/1102/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF ENTRY PORCH; ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION; CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BOUNDARY WALL AND GATE AT THE EBURY ROOMS, EBURY ROAD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 1BL

The application was for construction of entry porch; alterations to fenestration; construction of a new boundary wall and gate at The Ebury Rooms, Ebury Road, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that since publication of the officer report Batchworth Community Council had withdrawn its objection.

Committee Members had no questions or objections to the application, considering that the proposal would result in improvement to the area.

Councillor Morris moved, and Councillor Whately-Smith seconded, that the application be approved subject to conditions. On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to conditions.

PC192/26 26/1116/FUL – CONSTRUCTION OF DETACHED GARAGE, GREENHOUSE AND BIN STORE, ALTERATIONS TO DRIVEWAY, CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACCESS GATE TO GARAGE AREA, ALTERATIONS TO HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, DRAINAGE AND IRRIGATION TANK AND EXTERNAL LIGHTING AT REDWOOD HOUSE, 12 TEMPLE GARDENS, MOOR PARK, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 1QJ

The application was for construction of detached garage, greenhouse and bin store, alterations to driveway, construction of new access gate to garage area, alterations to hard and soft landscaping, drainage and irrigation tank and external lighting at Redwood House, 12 Temple Gardens, Moor Park, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that Condition 2 required updating to correct discrepancies in the plan numbers, and to reflect that an updated levels plan had been received. Informative 4 also needed correction to reflect that the Biodiversity Net Gain exemption was a householder exemption, rather than because the scheme was below the de minimis threshold.

Parish Councillor Elizabeth Willetts of Batchworth Community Council spoke on the application.

A local resident spoke against the application.

The agent spoke in favour of the application.

Points raised by speakers against the application included: the proposal would cumulatively result in an urbanisation of the site, detracting from its rural character and be out of keeping with the registered park and gardens; harm would be caused to the significance of the Moor Park Registered Park and Garden and the Moor Park Conservation Area as well as to the Green Belt; there would be no public benefit and no very special circumstances to justify the harm caused; concern about the significant number of previous applications, numerous additions to the property, breaches of planning permission and destruction of trees; there should be consistency of approach to planning decisions given previous refusals; and the negative impact on wildlife and biodiversity arising from lighting.

Points raised by the speaker in favour of the application included: the application sought only to reinstate the garden and provide extensive landscaping and drainage enhancements following building work at the property; the scheme had been carefully and sensitively designed in the context of the site location; and the applicant had engaged with officers and

responded to concerns raised during the planning process resulting in amendments to the proposal.

In response to points raised by speakers against the application, the Planning Officer summarised the main differences between the current and previously refused applications. This included a reduction in the extent of hardstanding to the front of the property; removal of the turning area; removal of the parking area which would have been visible from Temple Gardens; removal of the woodland walk and the additional hardstanding to the east leaving a mown grassed walkway; removal of the gabion walls and replacement with a more natural sloping bank down to the landscaped garden; relocation of the refuse collection spot away from the front boundary; and a further enhancement of the soft landscaping around the perimeter of the site, creating a betterment.

The Planning Officer also reported that the Conservation Officer had withdrawn their previous objection following the submission of amended plans which replaced the paladin fencing accompanying the sliding gate with hedgerow. With regard to concerns about lighting and the impact on wildlife, a condition was proposed which would require details of lighting to be submitted in order to enable this to be controlled as part of the discharge conditions application and Herts Ecology had not raised any objection to the application. With regard to the size of the gate at 2 metres high, the Planning Officer clarified that gates of such height were permissible under permitted development without a requirement for planning permission.

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

- A Committee Member commented that notwithstanding that the applicant had reduced the scale of the development following previous refusal, there remained a number of concerns. These included objections by The Gardens Trust and Historic England; the removal and death of trees arising from previous works; the cumulative impact of development and the increase in the built form footprint; and the urbanising effect of the additional structures and hardstanding on a sensitive site which was of great importance to the character of the area and which would harm the openness of the Green Belt.

- Responding to the above points, the Planning Officer reported that the plot coverage was calculated to be c13.5%, which was within the 15% set out within the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal. Hardstanding was regarded to be an engineering operation, which was considered to be an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt. The proposed outbuildings were all considered to be of a size and scale which were ancillary to the main dwelling and therefore compliant with policy DM2, and additionally the plot was very large. Collectively, therefore, the impact on openness and also heritage impacts were not considered to be sufficient to justify refusal of the application.

- Another Committee Member highlighted that Historic England had identified only minor harm, which needed to be balanced against any public benefit and expressed the view that a potential benefit was an increase in trees. A rainwater tank could be considered a necessity in the current climate conditions, and the alterations to the drive and garage and the greenhouse might not be considered to be detrimental. Another Committee Member expressed the view that the proposal represented a significant improvement on the previous application and should be supported.

Councillor Morris moved, and Councillor Cooper seconded, that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal would result in an urbanising form of development which caused harm to the Green Belt and heritage assets. Full wording of the reasons for refusal to be circulated after the meeting.

On being put to the vote this was carried, the voting being 5 for, 3 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused on the grounds that the proposal would result in an urbanising form of development which caused harm to the Green Belt and heritage assets. Full wording of the reasons for refusal to be circulated after the meeting.

PC193/26 26/1228/FUL – INSTALLATION OF LIGHTING TO GOLFPOD FACILITY AT RICKMANSWORTH MUNICIPAL GOLF CLUB, MOOR LANE, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE WD3 1QL

The application was for installation of lighting to Golfpod facility at Rickmansworth Municipal Golf Club, Moor Lane, Rickmansworth.

The Planning Officer reported that there were no updates.

Councillor Cooper moved, and Councillor Price 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.

PC194/26 26/1253/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION; REMOVAL OF CHIMNEY STACKS; ALTERATIONS TO THE FENESTRATION; CONSTRUCTION OF PATIO AT 42 MARLIN SQUARE, ABBOTS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE WD5 0EG

Consideration of this application was deferred to a meeting to be held on 28 October 2026.

PC195/26 26/1263/RSP – PART RETROSPECTIVE: CONVERSION OF GARAGE INTO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION; ALTERATIONS TO THE FENESTRATION AND ALTERATIONS TO DRIVEWAY AT 17 EDSON CLOSE, LEAVESDEN, WATFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE WD25 7BX

Consideration of this application was deferred to a meeting to be held on 28 October 2026.

PC196/26 26/1321/RSP - PART RETROSPECTIVE: CONSTRUCTION OF A PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION; LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING WITH A REAR DORMER AND FRONT ROOF LIGHT; INTERNAL ALTERATIONS; ALTERATIONS TO THE FENESTRATION; ALTERATIONS TO EXTERNAL MATERIALS; CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION AT 10 HYDE LANE, NASH MILLS, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HERTFORDSHIRE HP3 8RY

Consideration of this application was deferred to a meeting to be held on 28 October 2026.

PC197/26 26/1359/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION, AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP; ALTERATIONS TO LANDSCAPING INCLUDING DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDING; INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AT 36 GIRTON WAY, CROXLEY GREEN, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 3QN

Consideration of this application was deferred to a meeting to be held on 28 October 2026.

CHAIR