

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 21 JANUARY 2021

PART I - DELEGATED

10. **20/2546/FUL - Two storey front and rear extensions, single storey rear extension, conversion of existing garage into habitable accommodation and replacement roof including increase in ridge height and extension to hardstanding to frontage, provision of external insulation and render at 4 BEECHWOOD AVENUE, CHORLEYWOOD, HERTS, WD3 5RL (DCES)**

Parish: Chorleywood

Ward: Chorleywood South and Maple Cross

Expiry of Statutory Period: 27.01.2021

Case Officer: Lauren Edwards

Recommendation: That Planning Permission be Granted

Reason for consideration by the Committee: Called in by the Parish Council unless Officers are minded to refuse due to the impact of the proposed development on the neighbour at No.2 Beechwood Avenue, loss of soft landscaping and insufficient parking.

Relevant Planning History

- 1.1 AM/1096/73 -Two storey rear – Permitted
- 1.2 AM/1264/53 - Extension to garage – Permitted
- 1.3 20/0699/FUL - Two storey front extension, two storey rear and single storey rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable accommodation, replacement roof form including increase in ridge height, alterations to front and rear landscaping - Refused, for the following reason:
- R1 The proposed single storey rear extension, in conjunction with the two storey rear extension, would by virtue of its elevated siting and depth result in an overbearing and un-neighbourly form of development which would adversely impact the neighbour at No.2 Beechwood Avenue whilst also impacting the neighbouring habitable rooms via the loss of light and overshadowing . The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD.*
- 1.4 20/1940/CLPD - Certificate of Lawfulness Proposed Development: Removal of part of first floor rear extension and construction of ground floor rear extension – Approved, not implemented.

2 Description of Application Site

- 2.1 The application site is roughly rectangular in shape and located on the south western side of Beechwood Avenue in Chorleywood. The application dwelling is a two storey detached house finished in a white painted render. To the front the dwelling has a catslide roof feature with a front dormer and to the rear has a two storey flat roofed projection which forms part of a 1970s extension and a single storey extension with mono-pitched roof.
- 2.2 Land levels slope upwards across the site from North West to south east. This means that the neighbour at No.2 is at a much lower land level and No.6 is at a higher land level. Dwellings on the south western side of the road are also more elevated than those on the north western side.

2.3 The neighbour at No.6 is a two storey detached dwelling built of a similar architectural style to the application dwelling however this neighbour has undertaken a part single, part two storey rear extension and a front porch.

2.4 The neighbour at No.2 is a two storey detached dwelling which has undertaken a two storey front and side extension facing Carpenters Wood Drive, on the other side of the dwelling to the application site, however retains a catslide roof and dormer to the rear.

3 Description of proposed development

3.1 The proposed development seeks planning permission for two storey front and rear extensions, single storey rear extension, conversion of existing garage into habitable accommodation and replacement roof including increase in ridge height and extension to hardstanding to frontage, provision of external insulation and render.

3.2 The Officer's report for planning application referenced 20/0699/FUL described the development as:

The proposal includes the increase in the height of the main ridge by 0.6m with the formation of a gable to the side elevation and a true first floor to the front.

The proposed first floor front extension would project in line with the existing bay window feature.

The proposed single storey rear extension would have a depth of 4.1m along the north western flank and 3.1m along the south eastern side. This element would have a flat roof with a height of 3.1m. An open canopy projection is also proposed which would extend 1.1m beyond the deepest section of the extension and would extend across the width of the rear elevation.

The proposed two storey rear extension would have a depth of 3.1m beyond the existing two storey projection and would have a width of 5.3m. This element would be served by a pitched roof, hipped to the rear with a valley formed between the front gable and rear extension. The roof of the two storey rear extension would be set down 0.2m from the main ridge which is to be increased as highlighted above.

The proposal also includes the creation of a true first floor to the north western side of the rear which would have a depth of 1.3m and would be facilitated by the creation of a hipped roof on this side.

The proposal also includes a single storey front extension which would project in line with the existing bay and would have a mono pitched roof with a height of 3.7m. An open porch projection is also proposed which would have a pitched roof and a height of 4.4m. This element would project 0.5m beyond the main front elevation

The existing parking area to the front is proposed to be extended and hardstanding laid on the existing area of lawn with a new boundary wall constructed which would have a height of 0.5m.

The existing rear patio is proposed to be extended however there are no changes to the existing land levels proposed.

3.3 The above development was refused based on the unacceptable impact of the single storey element on the neighbour at No.2. This application now proposes the following changes from the refused scheme:

- Additional provision of external insulation and render. The agent has confirmed this will be smooth render painted white.

- Loss of light
- Loss of outlook
- Loss of sunlight
- No sun path analysis
- Excessive overall scale
- Gabled roof now introduced resulting in further impact
- Disagree with findings of Officer report for application reference 20/2699/FUL
- Increase in ridge not in keeping
- Disjointed and incongruous roof forms
- No site visit to neighbour at No.6 made
- Loss of front landscaping, increased flooding
- No informed of application by applicant's
- No formal notice received from council
- Any informal advise not binding
- Overbearing impact due to land level changes
- Loss of light owing to garden size and land level changes

5 Reason for Delay

5.1 Not applicable.

6 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

In 2019 the new National Planning Policy Framework was published. This is read alongside the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The determination of planning applications is made mindful of Central Government advice and the Local Plan for the area. It is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and that the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against another. The NPPF is clear that "existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework".

The NPPF states that 'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities'. The NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits.

6.2 The Three Rivers Local Development Plan

The application has been considered against the policies of the Local Plan, including the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) and the Site Allocations Local Development Document (adopted November 2014) as well as government guidance. The policies of Three Rivers District Council reflect the content of the NPPF.

The Core Strategy was adopted on 17 October 2011 having been through a full public participation process and Examination in Public. Relevant policies include Policies CP1, CP8, CP9, CP10 and CP12

The Development Management Policies Local Development Document (DMLDD) was adopted on 26 July 2013 after the Inspector concluded that it was sound following Examination in Public which took place in March 2013. Relevant policies include DM1, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

At a meeting of Full Council on Tuesday 20 October 2020, the Council agreed that the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan (Referendum Version, August 2020) should proceed to referendum on 6 May 2021 (as required by Local Government and Police and Crime Commissioner (Coronavirus) (Postponement of Elections and Referendums) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020). A Decision Statement was subsequently published on 21 October. In accordance with Planning Practice Guidance relating to Neighbourhood Planning, the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan can now be given significant weight in decision making, so far as the plan is material to the application. Policy 2 is relevant.

6.3 Other

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

The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011. The growth and Infrastructure Act achieved Royal Assent on 25 April 2013.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Habitat Regulations 1994 may also be relevant.

7 **Planning Analysis**

Whilst a site visit has not been conducted for this application due to the on-going Coronavirus pandemic, previous site visits have been made to the application site and No.2 Beechwood Avenue. Other platforms such as Google Maps and Google Street View was also used to aid the Officer's assessment. It is considered that the information received and use of other technological platforms has enabled the LPA to assess the application.

7.1 Impact on Character and Street Scene

- 7.1.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) seeks to promote buildings of a high enduring design quality that respect local distinctiveness and Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) relates to design and states that in seeking a high standard of design the Council will expect development proposals to 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area'. Development should make efficient use of land but should also respect the 'distinctiveness of the surrounding area in terms of density, character, layout and spacing, amenity, scale, height, massing and use of materials'; 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area' and 'incorporate visually attractive frontages to adjoining streets and public spaces'.

7.1.2 Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document sets out that in order to prevent a terracing effect and maintain an appropriate spacing between properties in character with the locality, two storey side extensions may be positioned on the flank boundary provided that the first floor element is set in by a minimum of 1.2m. However this distance must be increased in low density areas or where the extension would have an adverse effect on an adjoining property.

7.1.3 The Officer report for application reference 20/0699/FUL outlined the following:

"It is acknowledged that the proposed extensions would significantly alter the appearance of the application dwelling and significantly increase its overall scale however, on balance, it is not considered that it would result in demonstrable harm to the character of the dwelling or area for the reasons outlined below.

Beechwood Avenue is predominantly characterised by detached dwellings and whilst the neighbours immediately adjacent to the application dwelling were originally built of a similar architectural style and scale to the application dwelling (including those along Carpenters Wood Drive), there is much greater variation in scale and architectural design of dwellings within the wider streetscene. Additionally, many have undertaken extensions to introduce true first floor levels and single storey extensions.

The proposed extensions would remain in line with the existing flanks which are both set in by a minimum of 1.4m therefore spacing would be retained to both boundaries.

The proposal includes an increase in ridge height which Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD discourages where there is a linear step in ridge height or uniformity in their design. The proposed increase in ridge would retain the step in ridge heights along this part of Beechwood Avenue and given that the neighbour at No.2 has undertaken two storey front extensions there is no longer a uniformity in the roof forms of this part of the streetscene.

The proposed south eastern flank would not be as readily apparent from the streetscene as the north western side; however, the differing roof forms would create interest along the flanks to break up this elevation and a hipped roof would be retained to minimise the overall bulk. As such it is not considered that the proposed creation of a true first floor would appear unduly prominent within the streetscene.

The proposed two storey rear extension would be in line with the main flank and would have a pitched roof form set down from the rear. This element would appear subordinate to the new roof forms and would not appear incongruous or unduly prominent, particularly given that it would be hipped to the rear.

Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD outlines that single storey rear extensions to detached dwellings should not generally exceed a depth of 4m and that single storey side extensions will be assessed on their own individual merits in relation to proximity to the boundary.

The proposed single storey rear extension would have a flat roof form with a maximum depth of 4.1m from the existing rear building line, approx. 6m from the original, in addition to an open canopy projection which would extend 1.1m beyond this element. Whilst the proposed extension would marginally exceed the guidance of Appendix 2 when read in the context of the size of the site and that there are other similar extensions evident within the streetscene it is not considered that this element would result in unacceptable harm in this respect. This does not however outweigh the identified harm to neighbouring amenity which is discussed at section 7.2 below.

The proposal also includes a single storey front extension and porch projection. There are other similar porches and various front projections evident within the streetscene and given

that proposed would not be excessive in scale it is not considered that these elements would appear incongruous or unduly prominent.

The proposal also includes the extension of the existing patio. There are no land level changes proposed and the rear garden would still retain a substantial area of lawn. As such it is not considered that this element would appear out of character within the residential setting.

The proposed extension to the driveway would result in the loss of some existing soft landscaping which is regrettable however the applicant could extend the hardstanding without requiring planning permission. The new boundary wall would have a height of 0.5m and even at its elevated height relative to No.2 is not considered to appear unduly prominent.”

7.1.4 Since the assessment of the previous application the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan is now relevant. Policy 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan states:

‘All development should seek to make a positive contribution to the ‘street scene’ by way of frontage, building line, scale and design.’

7.1.5 The proposed external insulation would still be finished in white painted smooth cast render as previously proposed and as such is not considered to be unacceptable.

7.1.6 The proposed development now proposes a reduction to the single storey rear element and as such would be an improvement to the development assessed above which was also considered to be acceptable.

7.1.7 It is not considered that the proposal would be contrary to the Policies set out within the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan relevant in this respect.

7.1.8 The development would therefore be acceptable in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy, Policies DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document and Policy 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan (Referendum Version, August 2020).

7.2 Impact on amenity of neighbours

7.2.1 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. The Design Criteria as set out in Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD stipulates that development proposals must not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties or to the general street scene; respect the character of the property/street scene particularly with regard to the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors and materials.

7.2.2 Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document sets out that in order to prevent a terracing effect and maintain an appropriate spacing between properties in character with the locality, two storey side extensions may be positioned on the flank boundary provided that the first floor element is set in by a minimum of 1.2m. However this distance must be increased in low density areas or where the extension would have an adverse effect on an adjoining property.

7.2.3 The Officer report for application reference 20/0699/FUL outlined the following:

Rear extensions should not intrude into a 45 degree splay line drawn 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 the dwellings and

consideration will also be given to the juxtaposition of properties, land levels and the position of windows and extensions on neighbouring properties.

Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD outlines that single storey rear extensions to detached dwellings should not generally exceed a depth of 4m and that single storey side extensions will be assessed on their own individual merits in relation to proximity to the boundary.

The neighbour at No.6 is sited on a higher land level to the application dwelling and has undertaken a single storey extension and replacement rear dormer.

The proposed flank would be 4.5m deeper overall at first floor level than existing adjacent to this neighbour. However, it would remain set in from the boundary by 1.7m. Whilst there would be a true gable end formed to the front the main section of roof would be pitched away from this neighbour and the two storey rear projection hipped to the rear.

When taken from the point on the boundary level with the rear dormer of this neighbour the proposed two storey extension would intrude a 45 degree splay line by 3.2m. However from the corner of the dormer would only intrude by 0.6m and not at all from the single storey extension. The application site is also sited on a lower land level with the two storey element set in by 1.7m and set down from the main ridge. The proposed single storey rear extension would have a depth of 3.1m with an additional 2.3m of open canopy. As such the main single storey extension would comply with Appendix 2 and would not project beyond the extension of this neighbour. The canopy projection would which would project beyond would be open sided. As such given that this neighbour is on a higher land level and favourably orientated to the south eastern side of the site it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to this neighbour.

All first floor windows within the flank facing No.6 would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and top level opening only.

The neighbour at No.2 is sited at a much lower land level to the application site and is un-extended to the rear. The proposed development would result in a significant increase in built form adjacent to this neighbour. It is acknowledged that this neighbour has undertaken two storey front extensions and as such it is not considered that the formation of a true first floor front or increase in ridge would in themselves result in harm to this neighbour.

The proposal does however include the formation of a true first floor rear and single storey rear extension. As existing there is a two storey flat roofed rear projection which slightly exceeds the existing eaves height with a mono pitched single storey section. It is not considered that the formation of a true first floor would result in significantly greater impact than the existing projection however the proposed single storey extension would only be slightly lower than the maximum height of the mono-pitched section and would extend 4.1m deeper than the existing rear elevation and approx. 6m from the original rear wall adjacent to this neighbour. Whilst it is acknowledged that this would only marginally exceed the guidance of Appendix 2 the proposed extension would be at an elevated height relative to this neighbour who is orientated to the north west of the application site. Owing to its elevated height with the additional depth of the open canopy it is considered that the proposed single storey extension would be an oppressive form of development which would result in the loss of light to habitable room windows and private amenity space owing to the orientation of the sun. Given the siting of No.2 to the north western side of the application site, this neighbour would be adversely effected by virtue of overshadowing and loss of light for larger parts of the day.

The proposed two storey rear extension would not intrude a 45 degree splay line with this neighbour and when viewed in isolation may not in itself result in harm however when viewed in conjunction with single storey rear extension, the single and two-storey rear

extension as a whole would be an unneighbourly form of development as experienced by occupiers of No.2.

The proposal also includes the extension to the existing patio however no land level alterations are proposed and as such it is not considered that there would be any additional overlooking when compared with the existing views afforded by the natural level changes.

- 7.2.4 It is not considered that the proposed addition of external insulation would have a material impact on neighbouring amenity.
- 7.2.5 Officers note that a Lawful Development Certificate has been granted for a 4m deep single storey projecting from the original rear elevation. Given that the existing extensions would have to be removed from the dwelling in order to facilitate the development it is not considered that this should be afforded any weight by way of a fall-back position. The rear extension is now considered to be acceptable on their own merits for the reasons outlined below.
- 7.2.6 The proposed single storey rear extension has now been reduced in depth and the overhanging canopy also omitted. Overall the extension has been reduced in depth by 2m with the additional removal of the canopy which had a depth of 1.1m such that the extension would project 2m beyond the existing rear elevation. The land level changes between the application site and No.2 are noted however the extension would now comply with the guidelines of Appendix 2 and would be set in 1.7m from the boundary with No.2 with greater separation afforded between the main flanks of this neighbour and the proposed extension which would be in line with the existing side elevation. Therefore it is not considered that the proposed single storey rear extension would result in a detrimental impact by virtue of an unacceptable overbearing impact or loss of light.
- 7.2.7 The proposed higher level windows would result in some perceived overlooking when viewed from the garden on No.2 however these are 1.7m above floor level and would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and as such would not result in actual overlooking and as such would not be detrimental to the amenity of this neighbour. Whilst it is not considered that the proposed extension granted via 20/1940/CLPD is a valid fall-back position in so far as it relates to its overall scale it is noted that the fenestration that could be inserted within the side elevations of this element would have a greater impact than those now proposed by this scheme.
- 7.2.8 The proposed windows within the ground floor facing the boundary with No.6 are considered to be acceptable and given their siting off the boundary and that this neighbour is sited at a higher land level it is not considered that this windows would need to be obscure glazed. All proposed first floor flank windows would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and top level opening only.
- 7.2.9 As such owing to the revisions made the proposal is now considered to be acceptable subject to conditions and is not considered to result in demonstrable harm to the residential amenity of any neighbour. Therefore the proposal would be in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD.

7.3 Parking and amenity space

- 7.3.1 The existing dwelling has three bedrooms. Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the DMP LDD stipulates that dwellings containing four bedrooms should provide 3 onsite parking spaces.
- 7.3.2 The proposed development includes the extension of the existing driveway which would provide one additional on-site parking space. Three spaces would be provided to the frontage and therefore would comply with Appendix 5 in this respect.

7.3.3 Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD outlines that a four bedroom dwelling should provide 105sqm of amenity space. The application site would retain over 250sqm of amenity space and would therefore exceed standards in this respect.

7.4 Wildlife and Biodiversity

7.4.1 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.

7.4.2 The protection of biodiversity and protected species is a material planning consideration in the assessment of applications in accordance with Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the DMLDD. National Planning Policy requires Local Authorities to ensure that a protected species survey is undertaken for applications that may be affected prior to determination of a planning application.

7.4.3 A Biodiversity Checklist was submitted with the application and states that no protected species or biodiversity interests will be affected as a result of the application. As the proposal would result in alterations to the existing roof an informative regarding bats would be attached to any permission.

7.5 Trees and Landscaping

7.5.1 Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies document sets out that development proposals should seek to retain trees and other landscape and nature conservation features, and that proposals should demonstrate that trees will be safeguarded and managed during and after development in accordance with the relevant British Standards.

7.5.2 The application site is not located within a Conservation Area nor are there any protected trees on or near the site. As such it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any harm in this respect.

8 Recommendation

8.1 That PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the following 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: TRDC 001 (Location Plan), TRDC 002 (Block Plan), TRDC 003 (Floor plan and elevations) and TRDC 004 (Rear and side elevations).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning in accordance with Policies CP1, CP9, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policies DM1, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and Policy 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan (Referendum Version, August 2020).

C3 The proposed development shall be finished in materials as shown on the approved plans and as outlined in the submitted application form, excluding the external render which shall be finished in white painted smooth cast render.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory 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 Before the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the high level window within the single storey rear extension facing No.2 Beechwood Avenue 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 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).

- C5 Before first occupation of the development hereby permitted all first floor flank windows 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 windows 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).

- C6 Details of the proposed hardstanding including details of soakaways/permeable surfacing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The additional hardstanding shall be provided before the first occupation of the development and in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that adequate off-street parking and manoeuvring space is provided within the development so as not to prejudice the free flow of traffic and in the interests of highway safety on neighbouring highways in accordance with Policies CP1, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

- C7 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 side 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).

8.2 **Informatives:**

- 11 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 £116 per request (or £34 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. Please contact Hertfordshire Building Control (HBC) on 0208

207 7456 or at buildingcontrol@hertfordshirebc.co.uk who will be happy to advise you on building control matters and will protect your interests throughout your build project by leading the compliance process. Further information is available at www.hertfordshirebc.co.uk.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - Your development may be liable for CIL payments and you are advised to contact the CIL Officer for clarification with regard to this. It is a requirement under Regulation 67 (1), Regulation 42B(6) (in the case of residential annexes or extensions), and Regulation 54B(6) (for self-build housing) 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.

- 12 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.
- 13 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in its consideration of this planning application, in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The development maintains/improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.
- 14 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).