

9. **18/1497/FUL: Single storey front extension and two storey and single storey rear extension at 5 GROVE FARM PARK, NORTHWOOD, HA6 2BQ (DCES)**

Parish: Batchworth Community Council  
Expiry of Statutory Period: 26.09.2018

Ward: Moor Park and Eastbury  
Case Officer: Claire Wilson

Recommendation: That Planning Permission be Granted.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: This application has been called in by three members of the Planning Committee and by Batchworth Community Council.

Update: This application was deferred at the October Planning Committee to allow members to visit the site.

An Informative regarding National Grid apparatus in the vicinity has been added.

## 1 Relevant Planning History

1.1 8/207/76: Erection of 63 dwellings with garages. Application permitted.

1.2 18/1004/PREAPP: Pre-application: Single storey front extension and two storey rear extension.

Summary of advice offered: *In summary, concern is raised with regard to the two storey rear extension in its current form. The proposed two storey rear extension by reason of its depth, width and height would result in a prominent form of development which would detract from the residential amenities of the streetscene and would be visually dominating from no.6 Grove Farm Park. This would be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD.*

*The Local Planning Authority would encourage amendments to be made prior to the submission of an application. Setting the ridge of the gabled element down from the ridge of the main dwelling and a reduction in width and depth would help minimise the identified harm above.*

## 2 Description of Application Site

2.1 The application site consists of a two storey detached dwelling located on the eastern side of Grove Farm Park and occupies a corner plot location. Grove Farm Park is a residential estate made up of a series of cul-de-sacs branching off the main access road. The existing dwelling has a part gabled roof form with sloping cat-slide over an existing integral garage located to one side of the dwelling. It is of a similar architectural design to most other dwellings within Grove Farm Park, although some have been visibly extended. To the front of the dwelling is a paved driveway with provision for two off street car parking spaces.

2.2 To the rear of the site, is an amenity space of approximately 170square metres. The boundary treatment with the adjoining highway consists of close boarded fencing and hedging. The adjacent neighbour, no.6 is a two storey detached dwelling which is located at a slightly lower land level relative to the application dwelling. The building line is stepped with the rear wall of the neighbouring dwelling being set back relative to no.5.

## 3 Description of Proposed Development

3.1 The applicant is seeking full planning permission for a single storey front extension and two storey and single storey rear extension.

- 3.2 The proposed front extension would be located adjacent to the existing garage. It would have a depth of 2.3m and a width of 3.6m. It would be set back from the front wall of the garage by approximately 1m. The extension would have a crown roof with pitched roof surround with a maximum height of 3.3m.
- 3.3 To the rear, a part two storey, part single storey rear extension is proposed. The single storey rear extension would be the same width as the existing dwelling and would have a depth of 3.9m. It would have a flat roof form with a height of 3m. Two lantern rooflights are proposed which would serve the kitchen and living room.
- 3.4 The two storey element would be set in from the southern flank elevation of the dwelling by approximately 2.4m and in from the northern flank by 1.9m. It would have depth of approximately 3.4m and a width of 7.9m. It would have a catslide roof form and the external walls would be finished with black timber weather boarding. Two rooflights would be located in the roof form of the extension and would serve the landing.
- 3.5 Amended plans have been received during the course of the application. The amendments are as follows:
- Two storey extension set in by 1.9m from the northern flank wall of the dwelling
  - Reduction in number of rooflights from 6 to 2
  - Patio area indicated on the proposed block plan. Confirmation has also been received from the applicant that this would be of a porous material.
  - Change in external materials from tile hanging to first floor external walls to timber weather boarding.

## **4 Consultation**

### **4.1 Statutory Consultation**

#### **4.1.1 Batchworth Community Council: [OBJECTION]**

Batchworth Community Councillors have visited the 5 Grove Farm Park, Northwood site of this Planning Application and studied the likely impact of the proposed new development from:-

1. The road side view – not particularly helpful because of the high hedge
2. The garden of the neighbouring residence (6 Grove Farm Park) – much more helpful giving a significantly better view of the proposed building area and impact on these neighbours

The BCC Councillors are particularly concerned about:

1. The unacceptable increase in new build footprint that is inconsistent with character of Grove Farm Park housing that the residents have, over the years, fought to maintain and have hitherto been supported by TRDC in their effort.
2. The change in the slope and gradient of the roof line making the new build house totally different from the uniformity of roofing appearance anywhere else in Grove Farm Park.
3. The intention to hang grey tiles on the exterior walls that is inconsistent with the existing black timber or brick uniformity throughout Grove Farm Park
4. The loss of view and privacy that the encroachment of this 2 storey building will impact on 6 GFP and the precedent this will create for their other neighbours to similarly develop making them “hemmed-in” on all three sides

5. Concerns about a potential 2nd floor further extension at some future date – perhaps this can be prevented by a specific planning condition.
6. No mention is made on the Planning Application of a likely rear terrace/patio and the drainage/run off problems these are known to create – again such problems could be ameliorated by the inclusion necessary Planning Conditions.
7. Similar extension plans on Grove Farm Park have previously been refused by TRDC and consent for these current plans will create strong objection from those residents and/or a spate of new applications that are only likely to lead to the destruction of the uniformity that the housing on Grove Farm Park currently enjoys.

BCC does not wish to initiate “call ins” without having first exhausted proper consultation with Planning Officers and would therefore strongly urge a Site Visit to observe the impact of this application from the rear garden of 6GFP. Please would you advise if a Site Visit can be fixed and if so when and we will endeavour to arrange access. Finally, please note that we have been told that there has been very limited circulation about this Planning Application and even adjacent residents seem to be unaware of the submission of this application.

Officer Note: Batchworth Community Council were asked to clarify whether they wished to call in this application to the Planning Committee and confirmed that they did wish to. All adjacent properties, including those opposite were consulted.

#### 4.1.2 National Grid: [Informative suggested]

Considerations in relation to gas pipeline/s identified on site:

Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent’s legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following a diversion of this apparatus. The Applicant should contact Cadent’s Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays.

If any construction traffic is likely to cross a Cadent pipeline then the Applicant must contact Protection Team to see if any protection measures are required. All developers are required to contact Cadent’s Plant Protection Team for approval before carrying out any works on site and ensuring requirements are adhered to.

Email: [plantprotection@cadentgas.com](mailto:plantprotection@cadentgas.com) Tel: 0800 688 588

## 4.2 **Public/Neighbour Consultation**

4.2.1 Number consulted: 10                      No of responses received: 9

4.2.2 Site Notice:                      N/A                      Press notice: N.A

4.2.3 Summary of Responses:

- The extension will set a precedent
- The proposal is not in keeping. The treatment of the north side elevation is different to anything else nearby;
- Ratio of new footprint to plot size (especially if a patio is added) is a concern and will obliterate the rear garden. It will contribute to the increased run off.
- New sky lights will create unwelcome light pollution

- Brick work, mortar and timber cladding should match the existing dwelling;
- Introduction of windows to the flank elevation will result in overlooking;
- New windows and sky lights would result in overlooking.
- Rooflights are an indication of using the existing roofspace for the dwelling making the property three storey
- This estate was designed for family homes not homes for multiple families.
- Concern that two storey extension will result in a loss of light to lounge and bedroom windows given close proximity of no.4 and 6.
- The two storey rear extension will create a very enclosed atmosphere
- Impact on value of properties
- Should there be plans to install air conditioning units, we do not want them put between our property and extension
- Hedge on northern boundary not indicated on plans
- Impact on parking as cars already overhang the pavement. Narrow width of the highway means that there is no on-street car parking
- Materials including tile hanging is not in keeping with the existing dwelling
- Front extension will impact on sight lines and therefore highway safety concern
- Amended plans have done little to minimise concern
- No issues of congestion in the vicinity of Grove Farm Park
- It is a matter for debate as to how much uniformity there is. There are many styles/colours of garage doors, windows, roof tile, cladding
- Suggestions of additional noise are unfounded
- This is a relatively tightly packed estate – views are likely to be more interrupted than in Moor Park
- Front and rear extensions already in Grove Farm Park. One must consider a residents desire to extend as moving is costly.

Officer response: Value of properties is not a material planning consideration. Other comments made will be addressed in the analysis below.

## **5 Reason for Delay**

5.1 Committee cycle and to allow for Members to visit the site

## **6 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation**

### **6.1 National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance**

On 24 July 2018 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 2018 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 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, 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, DM8, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

### 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**

### 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 With regard to single storey front extensions, Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD advises that applications will be assessed on their individual merits and should not be excessively prominent in the streetscene. The proposed front extension would remain set back from the forward most projection of the dwelling which accommodates the integral garage thereby maintaining this as the principle feature of the dwelling. As such, the extension would not appear unduly prominent by reason of its proposed depth. Residents have raised concern regarding the design of the front extension as it includes a flat roof form. In response, a crown roof form is proposed rather than a full flat roof form, meaning that the extension would include a section of flat roof with pitched roof surround which would minimise the impact of the extension. Whilst it is acknowledged that a crown roof design is not a common feature within the Grove Farm Park estate, the style of extensions do vary including at no.62 which has a gabled single storey extension.
- 7.1.3 To the rear, a part two storey, part single storey extension is proposed. Due to the corner plot location of the dwelling, the extensions would be readily visible. In terms of design, the two storey element would have a catslide roof form. Whilst this is acknowledged to be

unusual, a catslide roof form would not be an incongruous feature given the catslide roof form to the front elevation of the existing dwelling. Furthermore, this design has been chosen as concern was raised as to the bulk of a gabled two storey rear extension at the pre-application stage. As such, a catslide roof form helps to minimise the overall bulk and massing of the dwelling particularly given the prominent location of the site.

- 7.1.4 The original plans indicated that the flank wall of the two storey rear extension would be set in from the flank wall of the existing dwelling by 0.5m. As noted, the dwelling occupies a corner plot location in close proximity to the adjoining highway. Concern was raised that the limited distance of 0.5m to the highway would result in a prominent form of development. In response, amended plans have been received which indicate a new distance of 1.9m from the flank wall of the dwelling. Whilst it is acknowledged that it would still be a highly visible extension, given the distance from the existing flank wall of the dwelling and the reduced bulk as a result of the catslide roof form, it is not considered that significant demonstrable harm would occur.
- 7.1.5 It is noted that the plans specify that the proposed extension would be tile hung to match existing. Residents have raised concern that this statement is inaccurate as there is no tile hanging on the existing dwelling and in addition that this would be out of character. In response, the applicant has amended the plans to indicate that the finish of the external walls of the two storey extension would be timber boarding which would be in keeping with other forms of development on the estate.
- 7.1.6 The original plans indicated that six rooflights would be located within the roofslope of the two storey extension. Officers considered that this was an excessive number and would have appeared cluttered on the roof form. Amended plans have reduced the number to two which is viewed to be more acceptable. Residents have raised concern that the rooflights are proposed to accommodate loft accommodation. In response, the floor plans show that these would be to serve first floor accommodation serving the landing. A loft conversion is not proposed.
- 7.1.7 A single storey rear extension is also proposed which would have a depth of 3.9m. This would have a flat roof form. Some views of the flat roof would be obtained given the location of the site. However, given the nature of this aspect of the development as single storey, it is not considered that significant harm would occur to justify refusal.
- 7.1.8 Residents have raised concern that the development would result in a building footprint and patio area which would be disproportionate to the size of the plot. In response, the development has been designed to be in accordance with the guidance set out in relation to detached dwellings in Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD. Whilst it is acknowledged that it would be a relatively large addition to the dwelling, there would still be adequate soft landscaping retained to the rear and the extension would bring the dwelling no closer to the flank boundaries than existing.
- 7.1.9 In summary, given the amended plans received and subject to conditions, it is not considered that the development would result in harm to the visual amenities of Grove Farm Park and therefore no objection is raised. The development is considered acceptable and in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD.

## 7.2 Impact on amenity of neighbours

- 7.2.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that the 'Council will expect all development proposals to protect residential amenities by taking into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space'. Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD states that 'oversized, unattractive, and poorly sited development can result in loss of light and outlook for neighbours and detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene'.

- 7.2.2 The proposed single storey front extension would not result in any harm to no.6 Grove Farm Park given it would be screened by the existing catslide projection. There would also be no harm to neighbours located directly opposite the front of the site or to the north given the separation by the highway.
- 7.2.3 The applicant is also seeking permission for a two storey and single storey rear extension. Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD states the following with regard to two storey extensions:
- 'Rear extensions should not intrude into a 45 degree splay line drawn across the 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.'*
- 7.2.4 The submitted block plan indicates that there would be no intrusion of the 45 degree line when taken from the boundary with no.6. It is acknowledged that this neighbour is set at a lower land level, however, the catslide roof form acts to reduce the overall bulk and massing of the scheme and to prevent it from being unduly overbearing. Consequently, it is not considered that it would result in a loss of residential amenity to no.6. It is noted that the plans include a Juliet Balcony. However, this would be set in from the boundary with this neighbour and it is not considered that this would result in any increased impact relative to a first floor window.
- 7.2.5 The plans also include the provision of two rooflights. Neighbours have raised concerns that these would result in overlooking. In response, the rooflights would be flush with the roof form which would minimise any adverse impact and a condition shall also be added which would require them to be set 1.7m above floor level in order to further minimise harm to neighbours. With regard to light pollution, the rooflights are of modest size and whilst light would be visible from them, it is not considered that they would result in significant adverse harm to justify refusal on these grounds.
- 7.2.6 Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD advises that single storey extensions to detached dwellings should have a maximum depth of 4m. In this case the extension would have a depth of 3.9m and therefore would be in accordance with the guidance set out in Appendix 2. The extension would have a flat roof form and a height of 3m which is not considered to be excessive. In addition, the extension is located to the north of the neighbouring dwelling which therefore minimises the impact in terms of light loss. To ensure that this neighbour would not experience a loss of privacy, a condition shall be attached preventing the installation of windows to the flank elevation.
- 7.2.7 The extension must also be considered with regard to the neighbours located to the north of the site. The front elevations of these dwellings face the flank elevation of the application dwelling. It is considered that the amendments which have resulted in the two storey flank wall being set at an increased distance to the boundary with these neighbours minimises the prominence of the extension when viewed from the front elevation of these dwellings. As emphasised the catslide roof design also reduces the bulk and massing of the development in relation to these neighbours. With regard to overlooking, the original plans indicated a flank window serving bedroom 4. Officers raised concern with regard to the potential for overlooking given the close proximity between the two storey front projections of the neighbouring dwellings and the proposed first floor flank window. The repositioned two storey rear extension has resulted in the first floor flank window being relocated to the rear elevation. This has overcome officer concerns. It is noted that a single storey flank window is also proposed to serve a living room which residents have raised concern about. In response, given the window would be located at ground floor level and the separation by the highway, it is not considered that adverse harm would arise.

7.2.8 The rear elevation of the extension would face towards no.4 Grove Farm Park. However, it is not considered that the extension would result in any increased harm in terms of overlooking given that any views from first floor would be directed towards the front public facing amenity area of this dwelling. It is also not considered it would be unduly overbearing by reason of the design.

### 7.3 Amenity Space Provision for future occupants

7.3.1 In summary, given the amendments made, the development is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD.

7.3.2 Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD provides guidance on amenity space and sets out that a five bedroom dwelling should have 126square metres of amenity space.

7.3.3 In this instance, the development would have a rear amenity space of approximately 129square metres which would therefore be in accordance with Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD.

### 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 The application has been submitted with a Biodiversity Checklist and states that there would be no impact to any protected species. However, given that the works would affect a roofspace, it is necessary to add an informative reminding the applicant of what to do should bats be found to be present during the course of the development.

### 7.5 Trees and Landscaping

7.5.1 Residents have been raised concerns with regard to landscaping including that the existing hedge to the side boundary is not indicated on plan. There is no requirement for a hedge to be indicated on plan, however, this was observed on site. Given that it is not protected and can be removed without permission, no objection is raised to its removal.

7.5.2 Concern has been raised by residents with regard to the patio and potential drainage issues. The proposed patio would be located level with the existing ground and unlikely to cause significant drainage issues. The applicant has advised that the patio would be made of a porous material. Given the modest nature of the patio and the level nature of the site it is not considered necessary to require this to be a condition of the consent.

### 7.6 Highways, Access and Parking

7.6.1 Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy states that development will need to demonstrate that it provides a safe and adequate means of access. Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD states that a dwelling with four or more bedrooms should have three off street car parking spaces.

- 7.6.2 Concern has been raised by residents that the front extension would block sight lines which would impact on the safety and operation of the highway. Given the extension is set in from the boundaries and set back from the existing ground floor projection it is not considered that it would have a significant impact on safety and operation of the adjacent highway.
- 7.6.3 With regard to car parking, Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD specifies that a dwelling with four or more bedrooms should have three off street car parking spaces. The pictures submitted with the application indicate that two are currently parked on the driveway. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is some overhang to the pavement, this is the existing situation. In addition, the plans indicate the retention of the existing integral garage measuring 4.6m wide and a minimum of 5.2m deep internally, therefore of a scale to accommodate a vehicle. A condition shall be added to the consent requiring the garage to be retained for car parking only to ensure there is sufficient car parking for present and future occupiers.

## **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), SC/RT.2018.68.01, SC/RT.2018.68.02 C and SC/RT.2018.68.03 C
- Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, in the proper interests of planning and in accordance with Policies CP1, CP9, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM6 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).
- C3 The extensions shall not be erected other than in the materials as have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as shown on Drawing Numbers SC/RT.2018.68.02 C and SC/RT.2018.68.03 C and no external materials shall be used other than those approved.
- 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 The cill height of the two rooflights within the rear roofslope hereby permitted, shall be set 1.7m above the internal floor level and be permanently maintained thereafter.
- 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 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 flank elevations or roof slopes of the extensions 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).

- C6 Immediately following the implementation of this permission, notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any other revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) the garage shall be retained primarily for the garaging of private cars. No alterations shall be carried out to the garage such as to prevent its use for garaging private cars.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to ensure that on-site car parking provision is maintained to avoid the standing of vehicles on the adjoining highway to the detriment of safety and the free flow of traffic thereon to meet the requirements of Policies CP1, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

## 8.2 **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 £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](mailto: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](http://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 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 applicant and the Local Planning Authority engaged in pre-application discussions and further modifications were made to the development during the course of the application which result in a form of development that maintains/improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.
- 13 The applicant is reminded that the Control of Pollution Act 1974 allows local authorities to restrict construction activity (where work is audible at the site boundary). In Three Rivers such work audible at the site boundary, including deliveries to the site and running of equipment such as generators, should be restricted to 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- 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](http://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).

- 15 Cadent have identified operational gas apparatus within the application site boundary. This may include a legal interest (easements or wayleaves) in the land which restricts activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The Applicant must ensure that proposed works do not infringe on Cadent's legal rights and any details of such restrictions should be obtained from the landowner in the first instance.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the gas apparatus then development should only take place following a diversion of this apparatus. The Applicant should contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team at the earliest opportunity to discuss proposed diversions of apparatus to avoid any unnecessary delays.

If any construction traffic is likely to cross a Cadent pipeline then the Applicant must contact Protection Team to see if any protection measures are required. All developers are required to contact Cadent's Plant Protection Team for approval before carrying out any works on site and ensuring requirements are adhered to.