**10. 17/0602/FUL – Single storey front extension, first floor side extensions and extension to roof to include increase in ridge height and construction of front, side and rear dormers at 32 CLEMENTS ROAD, CHORLEYWOOD, HERTS, WD3 5JT for Mr Doyle**

◼

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parish: Chorleywood | Ward: Chorleywood South and Maple Cross |
| Expiry Statutory Period: 31 May 2017 | Officer: Suzanne O’Brien |
|  |  |
| **Recommendation:** That planning permission be granted. | |
|  | |
| Reason for consideration by the Committee: Application has been called by Chorleywood Parish Council. | |

1 **Relevant Planning History**

8/399/80 - Garage, Room In Roof - Permitted - 27.06.1980

8/359/87 - Garage, Extension To Living Room, Bedroom, Bedroom, Bathroom In Roof – Permitted - 13.07.1987

96/0798 - Raising of roof level to provide an additional room and alterations - Refused - 19.11.1996

97/0298 - Roof extension to rear - Refused - 27.05.1997

97/0656 - Roof extension to rear and extension to roof at front - Permitted - 09.09.1997

06/1973/FUL - Single storey front extension to form porch, first floor side and rear extension with roof alterations with an increase in ridge height to allow accommodation in roofspace with front and rear dormer windows - Refused - 12.01.2007

Reasons for refusal:

*The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, scale, siting and overall bulk would result in an overdominant and obtrusive building which would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties. Furthermore, the proposed alteration would be out of keeping with the design and character of both the existing dwelling and neighbouring buildings, thereby adversely affecting the visual amenities of the street scene, and as such, would be contrary to policies Gen 3 - Design Criteria, Section 4 set out in Appendix 2 of the Three Rivers Local Plan 1996-2011.*

*The proposed first floor extension, by reason of its proximity to the eastern boundary, would contribute to a ‘terracing effect’ in a low density area and would adversely affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties and general street scene and as such, would be contrary to policies Gen 3 - Design Criteria, Section 4 set out in Appendix 2 of the Three Rivers Local Plan 1996-2011.*

07/0385/FUL - First floor side extension, increase in ridge height and roof alterations to form habitable accommodation in the roofspace with front and rear dormer windows, single storey front porch extension - Refused - 23.04.2007

Reasons for refusal:

*The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, scale, siting and overall bulk would result in an overdominant and obtrusive building which would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties. Furthermore, the proposed alteration would be out of keeping with the design and character of both the existing dwelling and neighbouring buildings, thereby adversely affecting the visual amenities of the street scene, and as such, would be contrary to policies Gen 3 - Design Criteria, Section 4 set out in Appendix 2 of the Three Rivers Local Plan 1996-2011.*

*The proposed first floor extension, by reason of its proximity to the eastern boundary, would contribute to a ‘terracing effect’ in a low density area and would adversely affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties and general street scene and as such, would be contrary to policies Gen 3 - Design Criteria, Section 4 set out in Appendix 2 of the Three Rivers Local Plan 1996-2011.*

The application was also dismissed on appeal (reference: APP/P1940/A/07/2047547).

The Planning Inspector concluded:

‘Accordingly, the extended property’s increased height, massing and proximity to the boundary would fail to meet the design objectives and criteria set out in LP Policy GEN.3 and Appendix 2. These seek to ensure, among other things, that extensions to existing residential properties are well designed, respect the amenities of neighbouring properties and do not detract from the character of the original dwelling, especially in terms of the roof form and the general street scene.’

08/1660/FUL - First floor extensions and single storey extension, increase in ridge height and roof alterations to accommodate habitable accommodation in roofspace with two front dormer windows and new front porch - Refused - 17.10.2008

Reason for refusal:

*The proposed extensions, by reason of their design, scale, siting and overall bulk would result in an overdominant and obtrusive building which would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential property. Furthermore, the proposed alteration would be out of keeping with the design and character of both the existing dwelling and neighbouring buildings, thereby adversely affecting the visual amenities of the street scene, and as such, would be contrary to Policy GEN 3 and Appendix 2 of the Three Rivers Local Plan 1996-2011.*

10/1311/FUL - Single-storey rear infill, roof extension incorporating dormers and increase in ridge height and erection of porch - Permitted - 06.09.2010

16/2191/FUL - Single storey front extension, first floor side extensions and extension to roof to include front and rear dormers and side rooflights - Refused - 30.12.2016

Reason for refusal:

*The proposed development by virtue of its size, scale and design would result in overdevelopment of the dwelling which would result in a dominant, contrived and unduly prominent feature within the street scene and which would be dominant and overbearing to the neighbouring property at No.30 Clements Road to the detriment of their residential amenity. The intrusive nature of the proposed development would be exacerbated by the scale of the crown roof, the scale and design of the dormers, the height of the proposed front extension, visibility of the dwelling within the street scene and relationships with the neighbouring properties. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).*

2. **Detailed Description of Application Site**

2.1 The application site contains a detached bungalow located along Clements Road. The dwelling has accommodation within the roof space served by front, side and crown roof dormers. The existing building has a crown roof design. The neighbouring dwelling to the east (No.30) consists of a detached pitched roof bungalow which is set in front of the rear line of the application dwelling. The neighbouring dwelling to the west (No.34) consists of a semi-detached bungalow with accommodation within the roof space. No.34 has a two storey side and rear extension.

2.2 The rear boundary of the site adjoins the Chorleywood Common Conservation Area, but the site is not located within it. The neighbouring dwellings to the front and rear of the site are set on higher ground to the application site. The rear amenity space is set on higher land levels to that of the dwelling and is enclosed by vegetation.

2.3 There is a carriage driveway to the front.

3. **Detailed Description of Proposed Development**

3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the construction of a single storey front extension, first floor side extensions and extension to the roof to include increase in ridge height and construction of front, side and rear dormers.

3.2 The single storey front extension would be sited along the east aspect of the dwelling in front of the store. The proposed extension would have a depth of 2m and width of 4.1m to be constructed in line with the east elevation. The proposed front extension would have a pitched roof with a gable end and a ridge height of 4.6m. A bay window would also be inserted within the front elevation of the existing front gable projection.

3.3 The proposed development would result in an increase in ridge height by 0.5m. The resultant building would have a height of 6.5m. The proposed development would also result in a first floor side extension over the existing single storey side projection. The first floor side extension would result in an extension to the existing crown roof so that the ridge line of the dwelling would have a width of 6.3m resulting in an increase in the width of the ridge by 3.2m. The roof form would have a depth of 3.7m. The proposed development would also result in a 0.5m increase in the eaves of the dwelling along the flanks so that they would have a height of 3m.

3.4 Dormer windows would be inserted within the front, side and rear elevations. Two dormer windows would be inserted within the front elevation. These would have a width of 2.6m, depth of 2m and height of 2.6m. Two dormer windows would be inserted within both side elevations of the roof form. They would be uniform in size with each having a width of 2.1m, depth of 1.4m and height of 2.2m. Two dormers would be inserted within the rear roof slope. The proposed dormers would each measure 3.5m in width, 2m in depth and 2.4m in height the. The rear dormers would have crown roofs and the side and front dormers would have pitched roofs.

3.5 Amended plans have been received reducing the height of the front dormers and reducing the size of the windows within the flank dormers.

4. **Consultation**

4.1 Chorleywood Parish Council

4.1.1 Summary: Objection.

4.1.2 *The Committee had Objections to this application on the following grounds and wish to call in unless officers are minded to refuse this application:*

* *The Committee noted the previous applications and felt there was not sufficient difference from the original applications 06/1973/FUL and subsequent 16/2191/FUL to meet our support.*
* *Out of keeping with the street scene.*
* *Overdominant and obtrusive building.*
* *The extension would affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.*

4.2Conservation Officer

4.2.1 Summary: No objection.

4.2.2 *Policy DM3 v) of the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (2013) states that development will only be permitted if the proposal does not harm important views into, out of or within the Conservation Area.*

*The application dwelling is located adjacent to the boundary of the Chorleywood Common Conservation Area. Although the extension is large in scale, it will not be widely visible from the Conservation Area, and as such will not have a negative impact on views from the Conservation Area, meeting Policy DM3 v).*

4.3 National Grid – No comments received.

5. **Neighbour Consultation**

5.1 No. consulted: 6

No. responses: 0

5.2 Site Notice: Posted 27 April 2017 and expires 18 May 2017

Press Notice: Posted 18 April 2017 and expired 12 May 2017

5.3 Summary of responses:

The Committee will be verbally updated of any comments received.

6. **Reason for Delay**

6.1 Not applicable.

7. **Relevant Local Planning Policies:**

7.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

7.1.1 On 27 March 2012, the framework of government guidance in the form of Planning Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance Notes was replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The adopted policies of Three Rivers District Council reflect the content of the NPPF.

7.2 The Three Rivers Local Plan Core Strategy:

7.2.1 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council on 17 October 2011. Relevant Policies include: CP1, CP9, CP10 and CP12.

7.3 Development Management Policies LDD:

7.3.1 The Development Management Policies LDD was adopted on 26 July 2013 having been through a full public participation process and Examination in Public. Relevant policies include: DM1, DM3, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

7.4 Other

7.4.1 The following Acts and legislation are also relevant: The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Habitat Regulations 1994, the Localism Act 2011 and the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013.

7.4.2 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (adopted February 2015).

8. **Analysis**

8.1 Design and Impact on Street Scene

8.1.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy stipulates that development proposals shall make efficient use of land whilst respecting the distinctiveness of the surrounding area in terms of density, character, layout and spacing, amenity, scale, height, massing and use of materials.

8.1.2 The Design Criteria in Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD stipulates that few properties are designed to incorporate future extensions, therefore any additions built need to take into consideration their effect on neighbouring properties and their visual impact generally. Oversized, unattractive and poorly sited additions can result in loss of light and outlook for neighbours and detract from the character and appearance of the original property and the general street scene. The Design Criteria as set out in Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD stipulate that extensions must not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties or to the general street scene and should respect the character of the property/street scene particularly with regard to the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors and materials.

8.1.3 In relation to increases in ridge height the Design Criteria of the Development Management Policies document stipulate that increases to ridge height will be assessed on their own merits at the time of a planning application. Where roof forms are of a uniform style/height and appearance, it is unlikely that an increase in ridge will be supported by the Council.

8.1.4 The Design Criteria also gives specific advice in relation to dormers and roof forms. In relation to dormers the Design Criteria state ‘dormer windows should always be subordinate to the main roof. They should be set below the existing ridge level, set in from either end of the roof and set back from the plane of the front or rear wall. The roof form should respect the character of the house if possible. Front dormers may not always be appropriate in the street scene’. In relation to roof forms the Design Criteria state ‘Crown roofs can exacerbate the depth of properties and often result in an inappropriate bulk and massing. As such, they are generally discouraged and more traditional pitched roofs are generally favoured’.

8.1.5 Specific guidelines within the Design Criteria state that development at first floor level and above should be set in from flank boundaries by a minimum of 1.2m.

8.1.6 The planning history of the site is extensive with a number of proposals refused and dismissed on appeal. However, in 2010 planning permission was granted (10/1311/FUL) for a ‘Single-storey rear infill, roof extension incorporating dormers and increase in ridge height and erection of porch’. The schemes refused under planning applications 06/1973/FUL, 07/0385/FUL, 08/1660/FUL and the recent 16/2191/FUL proposed Dutch hip roof forms where the bulk and massing of the proposed roof would be significant and harmful to the visual amenities of the street scene. The proposed development however would retain a hipped roof along the sides with the inclusion of flank dormer windows. The table below sets out the differences between the approved scheme 10/1311/FUL, refused scheme 16/2191/FUL and the current proposal:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 10/1311/FUL | 16/2191/FUL | Current Scheme |
| Increase in ridge Height | 0.6m | N | 0.5m |
| Width of ridge | 4.8m | 9.5m | 6.3m |
| Width of first floor | 11m | 12.3m | 11.8m |
| Depth of ridge | 2.7m | 4m | 3.7m |
| Depth of first floor | 9.9m | 8.8m | 10.2m |

8.1.7 The proposed development would increase the ridge height of the dwelling by 0.5m. The indicative street scene indicates that the dwelling would be set higher than both the neighbouring properties. However, the difference in height between No.34 and the application dwelling would not be readily apparent. Furthermore, the roof form would be hipped to the side so that the highest point of the roof would be set in from the flank boundaries. There would therefore be adequate separation between the highest point of the application dwelling and adjacent neighbouring dwellings. This separation would prevent the proposed development from appearing excessive in height in comparison to the neighbouring dwellings. The proposed eaves of the dwelling would be increased; No.34 is set on higher ground thus the eaves would not appear disproportionate in relation to this neighbour. No.30 however is set on slightly lower ground and has a relatively low level eaves and roof form. The bulk of the building would be greater closer to the boundary with No.30 than in comparison to the existing situation. However, the scale of the development would not appear dominant within the street scene relative to the neighbouring building and would not appear unduly prominent. Thus, the height of the eaves and ridge line of the dwelling would not result in any demonstrable harm on the street scene or appear over-dominant in relation to No.30.

8.1.8 The proposed development would increase the level of built form at first floor level within the roof form and would bring the built form closer to the flank boundaries in comparison to the existing bungalow. The plans indicate that the proposed first floor level would be set in a minimum of 1.2m from both of the flank boundaries in accordance with the criteria set out in Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document, thus it would not result in a terracing effect within the street scene. The set in and subordinate nature of the proposed flank dormers would prevent them from appearing over-dominant in relation to No.30.

8.1.9 The proposed development would include a crown roof form. The crown roof would have a greater width than that of the original dwelling but the depth of the ridge line would be less than that of the flat roof element of the existing dwelling. The proposed width of the roof would be greater than that of the approved scheme (10/1311/FUL) and would have a greater width than the ridge line of No.30. However, the scale of the roof form would not appear disproportionate or unduly prominent when read in context with the wider street scene. Crown roofs are not predominant in the area. However, considering that the existing dwelling has a crown roof the proposed roof form would not appear incongruous within the street scene, furthermore, the depth of the proposed roof would be less than that of the existing dwelling. The proposed increase in width of the existing crown roof would therefore not result in an unduly prominent feature and although larger in bulk, it is not considered that the scheme would appear over dominant in relation to No.30.

8.1.10 The flank dormers would be subordinate to the proposed roof and would have a hipped roof form thus the bulk would be reduced in comparison to the gable end flank dormers approved under planning permission 10/1311/FUL. The front dormers would be large however they would be comparable in scale to the dormers approved under 10/1311/FUL and they also would be set back from the front elevation, set down from the ridge and set in from the side roof slopes. The proposed rear dormers would be of a generous width. However, they would be subordinate in scale to the proposed roof and it is also noted that one larger triple pitched roof dormer was granted under planning permission 10/1311/FUL. The proposed two dormers would therefore be subordinate and would not result in overdevelopment of the proposed roof form.

8.1.11 The proposed development would result in the construction of a front gable extension. The officer’s report for the 2016 refused application (16/2191/FUL) made reference to the fact that the front gable extension would result in a prominent addition however its prominence would be exacerbated by the overall scale of the proposed development. The proposed front extension would be the same as that of the refused scheme however the overall bulk and massing of the scheme has been significantly reduced. The proposed front projection would be constructed in line with the existing west part of the front elevation of the dwelling. No.30 also has a front gable projection which the proposed extension would have a similar building line to. Thus, taking the built form of the neighbouring property into consideration the proposed single storey front extension would not result in an unduly prominent feature within the street scene or in relation to No.30.

8.1.12 The rear boundary of the site adjoins Chorleywood Common Conservation Area as such Policy DM3 of the DMP LDD applies and stipulates that ‘permission will not be granted for development outside but near to a Conservation Area if it adversely affects the setting, character, appearance of or views in to or out of that Conservation Area’. The Conservation Officer has confirmed that there would be limited views of the proposed development within the Conservation Area thus it would not result in any harm and would not be contrary to Policy DM3 of the DMP LDD.

8.1.13 In summary, the proposed development would have the appearance of a bungalow with accommodation within the roofspace. The proposed development would therefore maintain the character and appearance of the original dwelling and street scene. Although the relationship with No.30 is noted, the street scene is varied where properties have been extended to varying degrees. Overall the size and scale of the proposed development would not appear unduly prominent within the street scene. The proposed hipped roof form and subordinate flank dormers would also serve to prevent the proposed development from appearing over-dominant in relation to No.30 within the street scene. As such, subject to the use of materials to match, the proposed development is considered acceptable without resulting in any significant demonstrable harm on the visual amenities of the street scene in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policies DM1, DM3 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document.

8.2 Impact on Neighbours

8.2.1 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 residential 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.

8.2.2 To ensure that loss of light would not occur to the habitable rooms of neighbouring dwellings as a result of new development, the Design Criteria at Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document advise that two storey development should not intrude a 45 degree spay line across the rear garden from a point on the joint boundary, level with the rear wall of the adjacent property. This principle is dependent on the spacing and relative positions of properties and consideration will be given to the juxtaposition of properties, land levels and the position of windows and development on neighbouring properties.

8.2.3 The roof would be greater in height than existing and would extend closer to the eastern boundary. However the roof form would be hipped away from the side boundaries and as such the highest point of the roof form would be set in from the side boundaries. The roof form would also be hipped to the front and rear which would reduce the bulk and massing of the roof visible from the neighbouring dwellings. As such, the proposed increase in ridge height and bulk and massing of the proposed roof form would not result in any significant loss of light or impact on the visual amenities of the neighbouring dwellings. The increase in eaves would not result in any significant bulk and massing and would not result in any demonstrable harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.

8.2.4 The roof extensions and dormer windows would provide accommodation at first floor level, as such; the assessment on the impact on the adjacent neighbouring dwellings would include the 45 degree splay line test. The rear dormer window would be set in from both side elevations of the dwelling and set in from the side boundaries. No.34 has a two storey rear extension that has a similar building line to the application dwelling and has a single storey extension that extends beyond the rear elevation of the application dwelling. The first floor level at No.34 is set in from the common boundary. The proposed rear dormer would not intrude the 45 degree splay line taken from the rear most point of No.34 at the boundary. Two dormer windows would be inserted within the side elevation of the dwelling facing No.34. The dormers would be set in approximately 2m from the common boundary and would be set down from the ridge line of the building. Considering that they would not be excessive in size and would be set in from the flank elevation the proposed side dormers would not be overbearing on the neighbouring dwelling. The proposed ground floor extension to the front would be set in significantly from the flank boundary with No.34 and the front bay would be of limited depth. As such, the proposed development would not result in any significant loss of light or material harm to the visual amenities of No.34.

8.2.5 No.30 is set in front of the rear elevation of the application dwelling. The built form would be set closer to the common boundary with No.30 including the closest rear dormer window. The proposed rear dormer would be subservient to the main roof form and set in from the eastern elevation. Due to its depth and location the rear dormer would not intrude the 45 degree splay line taken from the boundary in line with the rear elevation of No.30. Two dormer windows would be located along the eastern elevation of the dwelling. These dormers would be set in from the side boundary and set down from the proposed ridge. They would not result in any significant loss of light or impact on the visual amenities of No.30. The proposed dormers would increase the level of built form at first floor level visible from the neighbouring property, however due to their subservient design, would not result in an overbearing or intrusive feature viewed from the neighbouring dwelling or private amenity space.

8.2.6 The proposed front extension would be of a size, scale and siting that would not result in any loss of light or harm to the visual amenities of No.30.

8.2.7 The front dormer windows would be set in from the side elevations of the roof form and side boundaries and, due to their location and height would not impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring dwellings in terms of loss of light.

8.2.8 The development would result in the increase in built form at first floor level along the side elevations of the dwelling. As previously highlighted the dormers would not result in an intrusive feature as viewed from the neighbouring dwellings. Amended plans have been received reducing the size of the windows within the flank dormers which would prevent perceived overlooking into the neighbouring properties. Any planning permission would include a condition requiring that the windows within the flank dormers would be obscure glazed and top level opening only. These are secondary windows and the bedrooms would be served by primary windows located within the dormers to the front and rear. As such, this condition would be considered acceptable and appropriate to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties.

8.2.9 There is an existing rear dormer providing accommodation within the roofspace. Although the rear dormers would be larger in width they would not materially increase the level of overlooking into the neighbouring properties in comparison to the existing situation. The neighbouring dwellings to the rear would be located over 60m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. This is a sufficient distance to prevent overlooking from the rear elevation of the development. The front dormers would have an outlook onto Clements Road and would not result in unacceptable levels of overlooking into the properties located opposite the site. The alterations to the fenestration at ground floor level would not permit unacceptable levels of overlooking into the neighbouring dwellings given the relationship and boundary treatment.

8.2.10 The buildings located to the front and rear of the site are set on higher ground. Thus, the increase in ridge height and extensions to the first floor level would not result in any loss of light or impact on the visual amenities of these dwellings. The proposed development is therefore considered acceptable.

8.2.11 In summary, subject to conditions on any consent, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in unacceptable adverse impacts on the residential amenity of any neighbouring dwellings so as to justify refusal of the development which would be acceptable in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document.

8.3 Amenity Space

8.3.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should take into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space. Section 3 (Amenity Space) of Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document sets out indicative amenity space standards and require 105sq.m to serve a four bedroom dwelling. There would be adequate rear amenity space of approximately 600sq.m to which would be sufficient to comfortably accommodate a four bedroom dwelling.

8.4 Highways, Parking and Access

8.4.1 Core Strategy Policy CP10 also requires that development makes adequate provision for all users including car and other vehicle parking. Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies document set out parking standards and advise that a four plus bedroom dwelling should provide parking for three vehicles.

8.4.2 The site can accommodate three cars.

8.5 Biodiversity

8.5.1 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.

8.5.2 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. The existing roof space is being used as habitable accommodation as such it is unlikely that the roof space is being used by bats. As the development would result in alterations to roofspace an informative would be attached to any planning permission informing that works to the building should proceed with caution.

8.6 Landscaping

8.6.1 No protected trees would be affected by the proposed development.

9. **Recommendation**

That subject to no new material planning considerations being raised PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

C1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In pursuance of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

C2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TRDC001 (Location Plan), clementsrd-32/0, clementsrd-32/1 rev d, clementsrd-32/2, clementsrd-32/3 rev e, clementsrd-32/5, clementsrd-32/6 rev e, clementsrd-32/8 rev d, clementsrd-32/9, clementsrd-32/10 rev d, clementsrd-32/9 (existing street scene0, clementsrd-32/10 rev a (proposed street scene).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning and in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policies CP1, CP8, CP9, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM3, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C3 Unless specified on the approved plans, all new works or making good to the retained fabric shall be finished to match in size, colour, texture and profile those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development and to maintain the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any other revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows or similar openings [other than those expressly authorised by this permission] shall be constructed in the elevations or roof slopes of the extension/development hereby approved.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C5 Before the first occupation of the building/extension hereby permitted the window(s) in the side dormers shall be fitted with purpose made obscured glazing and shall be top level opening only at 1.7m above the floor level of the room in which the window is installed. The window(s) shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

9.2 **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. Fees are £97 per request (or £28 where the related permission is for extending or altering a dwellinghouse or other development in the curtilage of a dwellinghouse). Please note that requests made without the appropriate fee will be returned unanswered.

There may be a requirement for the approved development to comply with the Building Regulations. The Council's Building Control section can be contacted on telephone number 01923 727132 or at www.threerivers.gov.uk for more information and application forms.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - If your development is liable for CIL payments, it is a requirement under Regulation 67 (1) of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (As Amended) that a Commencement Notice (Form 6) is submitted to Three Rivers District Council as the Collecting Authority no later than the day before the day on which the chargeable development is to be commenced. DO NOT start your development until the Council has acknowledged receipt of the Commencement Notice. Failure to do so will mean you will lose the right to payment by instalments (where applicable), lose any exemptions already granted, and a surcharge will be imposed.

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. Information on this is also available from the Council's Building Control section. 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.

I2 Bats are protected under domestic and European legislation where, in summary, it is an offence to deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat, intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat in a roost or deliberately disturb a bat in a way that would impair its ability to survive, breed or rear young, hibernate or migrate, or significantly affect its local distribution or abundance; damage or destroy a bat roost; possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat; and intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost.

If bats are found all works must stop immediately and advice sought as to how to proceed from either of the following organisations:

The UK Bat Helpline: 0845 1300 228

Natural England: 0300 060 3900

Herts & Middlesex Bat Group: www.hmbg.org.uk

or an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist.

(As an alternative to proceeding with caution, the applicant may wish to commission an ecological consultant before works start to determine whether or not bats are present. A list of bat consultants can be obtained from Hertfordshire Ecology on 01992 555220).

I3 The applicant is reminded that the Control of Pollution Act 1974 stipulates that construction activity (where work is audible at the site boundary) should be restricted to 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

I4 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 Local Planning Authority suggested modifications to the development during the course of the application and the applicant submitted amendments which result in a form of development that maintains/improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.