**10. 17/1207/FUL – Proposed single storey rear extension at SILFIELD HOUSE, THE GREEN, SARRATT, HERTS, WD3 6BP for Mrs Brenda Goodwin**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parish: Sarratt | Ward: Chorleywood North and Sarratt |
| Expiry Statutory Period: 31 July 2017 | Officer: Suzanne O’Brien |

 **17/1217/LBC – Proposed single storey rear extension at SILFIELD HOUSE, THE GREEN, SARRATT, HERTS, WD3 6BP for Mrs Brenda Goodwin**

◼

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parish: Sarratt | Ward: Chorleywood North and Sarratt |
| Expiry Statutory Period: 31 July 2017 | Officer: Suzanne O’Brien |
|  |  |
| **Recommendation:** That planning permission be refused and Listed Building Consent be granted.  |
|  |
| Reason for consideration by the Committee: Application has been called in by Sarratt Parish Council. |

 1 **Relevant Planning History**

1.1 W/4766/73 - Dining room, bathroom to kitchen – Permitted - 08.01.1974

1.2 8/43/85 - SILFIELD COTTAGE THE GREEN SARRATT - Dining room – Permitted - 20.05.1985

1.3 8/952/85 - Extension to Silfield Cottage – Permitted - 27.02.1985

1.4 8/952/85LB - Extension link to Silfield House – Not stated - 27.02.1985

1.5 94/467/8 - Erection of detached double garage and store to replace existing. – Refused - 02.08.1994

1.6 94/775/8 - Erection of detached double garage and store. – Permitted - 04.01.1995

1.7 94/793/8LBC - (Listed Building Consent) Demolition of 3 garages and stores and erection of detached double garage and store. – Permitted - 04.01.1995

1.8 16/0514/FUL - Proposed single storey rear extension – Refused - 17.05.2016

 Refused for the following reason:

 *The proposed extension in conjunction with the previous extensions and alterations would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. The proposed development would also spread development across the site. No very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness as such the proposal is contrary to Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework.*

1.9 16/0515/LBC - Listed Building Consent: Single storey rear extension - Permitted - 17.05.2016

1.10 16/1614/FUL - Single storey rear extension – Permitted - 23.09.2016

1.11 16/1665/LBC - Listed Building Consent: Single storey rear extension - Permitted - 23.09.2016

2. **Detailed Description of Application Site**

2.1 The application site consists of a two storey Grade II Listed Building. The application site is located on a corner plot at the junction of The Green and Red Lion Lane located within Sarratt (The Green) Conservation Area and Metropolitan Green Belt. The dwelling has an unusual footprint. The front elevation fronts The Green and the southern side elevation forms part of the boundary treatment fronting Red Lion Lane.

2.2 The dwelling has been extended with a single storey extension linking the previously detached two storey annexe to the main dwellinghouse. The vehicular access to the site is to the rear and serves a detached triple garage which is accessed via Red Lion Lane. Pedestrian access is provided to the front of the site. The boundary treatment along Red Lion Lane consists of a brick and flint wall.

2.3 The neighbouring property to the north is constructed close to the common boundary and extends beyond the rear elevation of the application dwelling and contains a number of windows at ground and first floor level facing the rear amenity space provision of the application site.

2.4 The Grade II Listed Building has the following listing:

*House. Late C17, cased and extended in C18 and mid C19. Timber frame to core, cased and extended in red brick, part whitewashed. Tile and slate roofs. 2 storeys. 2 bays originally. 2 bay C18 addition to left with 3 bay C19 range at right angles further left fronting onto the Green. Entrance elevation facing Red Lion Lane. Earlier range whitewashed with plinth, entrance to right, 2 ground floor 2 light casements, cambered heads, 2 first floor casements, sprocket eaves. Right gable end exposed framing, posts, rail, studs, tie beam, queen struts to collar. To rear an exposed post, external stack with offsets, lean-to outshut. C18 addition projects forward, large ground floor sash with a cambered head. 3 light first floor casement. Dentilled eaves. Taller ridge. Second bay with hip to left is incorporated in slate. roofed C19 block. 2 windows to front, original central entrance now a window, sashes, ground floor cambered heads. Right end stack. Lean-to to rear with entrance near angle with C18 range. Interior not inspected.*

3. **Detailed Description of Proposed Development**

3.1 This application seeks planning permission and Listed Building Consent for the construction of a single storey rear extension.

3.2 The proposed single storey rear extension would be sited to the rear of the existing two storey annexe building which is constructed along the southern boundary of the site. The extension would measure 2.4m in depth, 3.1m in width and would have a pitched roof form with a height of 3m. The existing pedestrian gate would be re-sited to the rear of the proposed extension, thus, the proposal would result in alterations to the existing boundary wall. The supporting information details that any alterations to the boundary would be replaced with materials to match existing. The development would also include the replacement of the plain tile hanging to the annexe with second hand clay tiles.

4. **Consultation**

4.1 Sarratt Parish Council

4.1.1 Summary: Support.

4.1.2 *The Parish Council supports this application and requests that if officers are minded to refuse this application, it is called into Committee.*

4.2Conservation Officer

4.2.1 Summary: No objection subject to conditions.

4.2.2 *I would not object from the listed building/conservation points of view. This is further to my previous comments on 16/0515/LBC and 16/0514/FUL.*

The Conservation Officer made the following comments in relation to applications 16/0514/FUL and 16/0515/LBC:

 *This small extension will be on a later part of this listed building which has been much altered and I would not object.*

 *The proposed materials are suitable for this listed building and the removal of the concrete tile hanging is welcomed by conservation.*

4.3 Herts Archaeology

4.3.1 Summary: No objection.

4.3.2 *In this instance due to its size, we have no comment to make upon the proposal.*

4.4Herts Ecology made the following comments in relation to application 16/0514/FUL:

4.4.1 Summary: No objection.

4.4.2 *We do not have any specific biological (species or habitats) data for the application site itself. The property lies opposite Sarratt Green, which is a Local Wildlife Site (our reference 82/005) designated for its grassland interest. The Green is also a registered village green. We have records of bats roosting in the area.*

 *I understand as part of the extension works, the existing, relatively recent, concrete hanging tiles will be removed and replaced with second-hand clay tiles more in-keeping with the age of the property.*

 *Photographs (submitted on-line and supplied at pre app stage) and aerial images (from Google and BING) show the property to be in good condition with well sealed hanging tiles and brickwork. The wall proposed for the extension looks to be sub-optimal for bats to access and use for roosting. The roof will not be affected.*

 *Due to the nature and extent of the proposals, I have no reason to request any ecological surveys in connection with this proposal. Notwithstanding, I advise a precautionary approach is taken and the following Informative is added to any permission granted:*

 *“Bats and their roosts remain protected at all times under National and European law. If bats or evidence for them is discovered during the course of any works, work must stop immediately and advice sought on how to proceed lawfully from Natural England: 0300 060 3900 or an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist.”*

 *I do not anticipate any adverse effects from these proposals on the village green.*

4.5 National Grid

4.5.1 No comments received.

5. **Neighbour Consultation**

5.1 No. consulted: 8

 No. responses: 0

5.2 Site Notices: Posted 16 June 2017 and expired 7 July 2017

 Press Notices: Published 16 June 2017 and Expired 7 July 2017.

5.3 Summary of responses:

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, CP11 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, DM2, DM3, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

 The Green, Sarratt Conservation Area Appraisal and Townscape Assessment (March 1994) is also relevant to this application.

 Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 3 – Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt (March 2004) provides further guidance on extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt is also relevant.

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 Green Belt

8.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraph 79) states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

8.1.2 Paragraph 87 of the NPPF sets out that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is considered inappropriate. Exceptions to this are:

• Buildings for agriculture and forestry;

• Provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;

• The extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the original building;

• The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

• Limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or

• Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

8.1.3 The proposed development would be considered under the extension or alteration exception.

8.1.4 Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) states that there will be a general presumption against inappropriate development that would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt, or which would conflict with the purpose of including land within it.

8.1.5 In terms of extensions to buildings, Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) states that extensions to buildings in the Green Belt that are disproportionate in size (individually or cumulatively) to the original building will not be permitted. The building’s proximity and relationship to other buildings and whether it is already, or would become, prominent in the setting and whether it preserves the openness of the Green Belt will be taken into account.

8.1.6 In relation to disproportionate additions specific guidance is provided in Supplementary Planning Guidance No.3, Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt. The SPG provided further explanation of the interpretation of the Green Belt policies of the Three Rivers Local Plan 1996-2011. These policies have now been superseded by Policy DM2. Nevertheless, the SPG provides useful guidance and paragraph 4.5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) advises that the guidance will be taken into account in the consideration of householder developments in the Green Belt until it is incorporated into the forthcoming Design Supplementary Planning Document. As a guide, the SPG advises that extensions resulting in a cumulative increase in floorspace of up to 40% compared with the original dwelling may not be disproportionate.

8.1.7 It is noted that in an appeal decision for The Well House, Commonwood, Sarratt (Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/13/2209050), the Inspector commented that;

 ‘*Whilst this SPG is some years old, in my opinion it remains relevant to the context of the above more up to date policies and as it was the subject of formal adoption and public consultation, I afford it significant weight.’*

8.1.8 This view was also reiterated by another Inspector at an appeal at 128A Toms Lane (Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/14/2220962) where the Inspector commented that:

 ‘*Whilst the SPG is some years old, in my opinion, it remains relevant to the context of Policies DM2 and CP11 and as it was the subject of formal adoption and public consultation, I afford it significant weight*.’

8.1.9 Thus, the SPG is still considered to be relevant and holds significant weight. The NPPF defines the original building as a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally.

8.1.10 The planning history of the site demonstrates that the existing annexe, the two storey structure which runs along the southern boundary, was detached from the main dwellinghouse and has been connected to the dwelling by a single storey extension granted permission in 1985. As the annexe was detached and is now adjoined to the dwellinghouse it would also be included as part of the enlargement and alteration to the original dwellinghouse. The proposed extension would result in an extension to the previously detached annexe. Judging from the planning history of the site the original dwelling had a floorspace of approximately 193sq.m, the existing extensions, including the annexe, have a floorspace of approximately 101sq.m and the proposed extension would have a floorspace of 7.4sq.m. The proposal would result in a cumulative increase in floorspace of 56% above the floorspace of the original dwelling, which would exceed the 40% guidance as set out in the SPG. Although the proposed extension would be considered to be relatively small in terms of its overall scale, cumulatively the previous extensions and alterations in conjunction with the proposed extension would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The combined footprint of the existing single storey extension, outbuilding and proposed extension would also fail to appear subordinate in scale to the footprint of the original dwelling and would spread development further along the southern aspect of the site away from the footprint of the original dwelling. The development would therefore constitute inappropriate development which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt.

8.1.11 The development should also be considered in relation to whether there would be any actual harm to the openness of the Green Belt. In relation to extensions Policy DM2 of the DMP LDD advises that ‘Extensions to buildings in the Green Belt that are disproportionate in size (individually or cumulatively) to the original building will not be permitted. The building’s proximity and relationship to other buildings and whether it is already, or would become, prominent in the setting and whether it preserves the openness of the Green Belt will be taken into account.’ The extension would be visible within the street scene, and while taking into consideration the existing built form, it is considered that the proposed extension would result in limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Notwithstanding this, the disproportionate nature of the proposed development in conjunction with the existing extensions together with the spread of development across the site would represent disproportionate additions to the original dwelling which by definition would be harmful.

8.1.12 Paragraph 88 of the NPPF stipulates that 'When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.'

8.1.13 The Design and Access Statement submitted with the application notes that an extension in the same location and of a similar scale has previously been refused. However, the supporting information states that since this refusal permission has been granted for a single storey extension to the rear of the dining room under planning permission 16/1614/FUL which supersedes the previous refusal. The extension granted under planning permission 16/1614/FUL had a footprint of 9.24sq.m; 1.8sq.m greater than that of the current scheme. However, planning permission for this extension was granted as the extension fell within one of the exceptions to the 40% rule as set out in paragraph 11 d) iii) of the SPG which allows for ‘In-fill extensions (e.g. if the existing building is ‘L’ or ‘U’ shaped) which do not increase the apparent bulk of the building.’ The extension approved under planning permission 16/1614/FUL did not propose any extension beyond the existing built form thus would not have resulted in any increase in the bulk of the dwelling or result in any further spread of development across the site. As such, it is not considered that the granting of planning permission 16/1614/FUL would justify further additions to the rear of the originally detached annexe building which would result in greater actual harm. Thus, no very special circumstances have been demonstrated that would overcome the harm to the Green Belt by virtue of the inappropriateness of the proposed development.

8.1.14 Although the proposed development would be not be considered to result in significant actual harm to the openness of the Green Belt this would not constitute a very special circumstance that would outweigh the harm arising from the inappropriateness of the development. As such, the proposed extension in conjunction with the previous extensions and alterations would result in disproportionate additions to the original dwelling and would constitute inappropriate development contrary to Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy, Policy DM2 of the DMP LDD and the NPPF.

8.2 Impact on Listed Building

8.2.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy relates to the ‘Design of Development’ and states that the Council will expect all development proposals to have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area and to conserve and enhance natural and heritage assets. Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document sets out design criteria for residential development that aim to ensure that development does not lead to a gradual deterioration in the quality of the built environment.

8.2.2 In relation to Listed Buildings, Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) advises that the Council will preserve the District’s Listed Buildings and will only support applications where the alteration would not adversely affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest both internally or externally or its wider setting.

8.2.3 Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that the Local Planning Authority have regard to the special architectural interest of a building stating that:

‘*When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets area irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.*’

8.2.4 The proposed single storey extension would adjoin the rear elevation of a previously detached annexe. The annexe was connected to the main dwellinghouse by a single storey side extension that was granted permission in 1985. The Conservation Officer raised no objections to the proposed extension in terms of its siting, scale or design. The Conservation Officer welcomed the changes to the tile hanging from plain tile hanging to second hand clay tiles. The proposed development would not result in any other alterations to the internal or external fabric of the building.

8.2.5 Thus, it is not considered that the extent of works or the design of the extension would have a detrimental impact on the significance of the designated heritage asset or impact on the special architectural or historic interest both internally or externally of the original Grade II Listed Building. The proposal would be in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM3 of the DMP LDD.

8.3 Design and Impact on Street Scene and Conservation Area

8.3.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy seeks to promote buildings of a high enduring design quality that respect local distinctiveness and Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy 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’.

8.3.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area. Extensions should not be excessively prominent and should respect the existing character of the dwelling, particularly with regard to the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors, and materials.

8.3.3 The site is also located within Sarratt, The Green Conservation Area as such Policy DM3 applies. Policy DM3 of the DMP LDD details that development in Conservation Areas will only be permitted if the proposal is of a design and scale that preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

8.3.4 The building is visible from public vantage points along The Green and the Conservation Area Appraisal describes the main characteristics of the area as:

o Linear development

o Low key vernacular architecture on a domestic scale

o Mixture of building styles and dates from early 16th century to 20th century

o Warm brick nestles next to flint and timber framing

o The rich textures of brick and brick and flint boundary walls

o Presence of boundary walls, railings or hedges provide interest to the street scene

o The Green and associated ponds.

8.3.5 The proposed development would be readily visible from public vantage points due to its location directly adjacent to the highway. However, it would not be of a size, scale or design that would appear unduly prominent or contrived within the street scene or Conservation Area and the Conservation Officer has no objection. As such, the proposed development would not result in any demonstrable harm to the overall character and appearance of Sarratt, The Green Conservation Area or the visual amenities of the street scene. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policies DM1, DM3 and Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD.

8.3.6 The site is located within an area of Archaeological significance. Due to the scale of the development it is unlikely that the proposal would have an adverse impact upon significant heritage assets.

8.4 Impact on Neighbours

8.4.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy stipulates that development proposals should protect residential amenities by taking into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space. The Design Criteria as set out in Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD stipulates that extensions should not result in loss of light to windows of neighbouring properties nor allow overlooking.

8.4.2 The proposed development due to its size, scale, siting and taking into consideration the relationship with the neighbouring properties relative to the proposal would not result in any unacceptable loss of light or harm to the visual amenities of the neighbouring properties to the north and south of the site.

8.5 Parking/Amenity Provision

8.5.1 The proposed development would not include an additional bedroom and would not encroach upon the existing parking provision which is sufficient to meet the standards of Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the DMP LDD. There is sufficient amenity space provision to accommodate the proposed development and serve the dwellinghouse.

8.6 Wildlife

8.6.1 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.

8.6.2 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 DMP LDD. The Biodiversity Checklist details that a survey is not required. The proposed development would adjoin an existing extension; the proposal would not result in any alterations to the roof of the existing structure but proposes replacement tile hanging. Herts Ecology commented a previous application 16/0515/FUL and noted that the site is located opposite a Local Wildlife Site and there are records of bats within the area. However, Herts Ecology advised that following viewing photos and due to the nature and extent of the proposals they requested an informative be attached to any planning permission.

8.7 Trees and Landscaping

8.7.1 No protected trees would be adversely affected by the proposed development.

9. **Recommendation for 17/1207/FUL**

That Planning Permission for application 17/1207/FUL BE REFUSED for the following reason:

R1 The proposed extension in conjunction with the previous extensions and alterations would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. The proposed development would also spread development across the site. No very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness as such the proposal is contrary to Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative:

I1 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in considering 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 encourages applicants to have pre-application discussions as advocated in paragraph 188 of the NPPF. The applicant did not have formal pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority and the proposed development fails to comply with the requirements of the Development Plan and does not maintain/improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.

10. **Recommendation for 17/1217/LBC**

That Listed Building Consent for application 17/1217/LBC 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: To comply with the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

C2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2269/01, 2269/02, 2269/03, 2269/04, 2269/05.

 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning, to protect the character and appearance of the Grade II Listed Building and in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C3 Before the building operations hereby permitted are commenced, samples and details of all proposed external materials, including windows and other openings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no external materials shall be used other than those approved.

 Reason: To preserve the special architectural interest of the Grade II Listed Building in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

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. Information and application forms are available at www.hertfordshirebc.co.uk. Alternatively the Council's Building Control section can be contacted on telephone number 01923 727130 or email building.control@hertfordshirebc.gov.uk.

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 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.