

## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 12 AUGUST 2021

### PART I - DELEGATED

**5. 21/0901/FUL - Single storey rear extension and roof extensions to create first floor level accommodation including rear gable and dormer windows at 75 QUICKLEY LANE, CHORLEYWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 5AE**

Parish: Chorleywood Parish Council

Ward: Chorleywood South and Maple Cross

Expiry of Statutory Period: 23.06.2021  
(Extension of Time: 16.08.2021)

Case Officer: Scott Volker

Recommendation: That Planning Permission be Granted.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: Called in by Chorleywood Parish Council unless Officers are minded to refuse for the reasons set out at 4.1.1 below.

#### **1 Relevant Planning History**

- 1.1 17/0310/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement two storey dwelling, including alterations to land levels, installation of new vehicular access and construction of cycle and bin storage to front – Refused May 2017 for the following reasons:

*R1 The proposed replacement dwelling by reason of its excessive width, depth and flat roof design would result in a dwelling that would be significantly out of character with the general built form of this part of Quickley Lane would not maintain the spaciousness of the area and would become an unduly prominent feature within the street scene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).*

An appeal was lodged and subsequently dismissed in May 2017 referenced APP/P1940/W/17/3188040.

#### **2 Description of Application Site**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a detached bungalow with predominantly red brick exterior and a traditional hipped roof form. The application site is located on the south-eastern side of a service road off Quickley Lane, close to the junction with Rendlesham Way. This service road runs parallel to the main thoroughfare at a ground level 3 metres higher. A wooded bank separates the two highways and screens the dwellings from the western side of Quickley Lane from the bungalows fronting the service road.
- 2.2 The site rises up from the highway with the dwelling at a level approximately 3 metres higher than the service road and the rear boundary of the site is approximately 3 metres higher again. Both this part of Quickley Lane and Rendlesham Way consist of detached bungalows of similar scale and design to the application dwelling, although No.75 Quickley Lane has recently benefitted from a loft conversion including hip to gable extensions and a rear dormer. No. 73 Quickley Rise has not undergone any visible extensions or alterations and this neighbour has a detached garage built in close proximity to the common boundary with the application site. The rear of the site abuts the private amenity space of No.3 Rendlesham Way.
- 2.3 The site has a vehicular access from Quickley Lane which leads to an attached garage along the north-eastern flank of the bungalow which cumulatively provide two off-street parking spaces within the site. The plot frontages to the properties within this part of Quickley Lane are relatively open although some small hedgerows are evident.

### **3 Description of Proposed Development**

- 3.1 Full planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension and roof extensions to create first floor level accommodation including rear gable and dormer windows.
- 3.2 The roof extension would effectively extend the roof form of the existing dwelling to the side above the existing attached garage located along its north-east aspect. This would extend the width of the ridge by 4.7 metres to total of 6.7 metres. There would also be a slight increase in ridge height of 0.1m to 5.3m. The loft space of the extended dwelling would be converted into habitable accommodation. The roof extension would be set in 1.2m from outside flank wall of the garage below and would slope down to an eaves height of 4.1 metres along the flank and 3.1 metres at the front.
- 3.3 The proposed single storey rear extension would have a first floor above which would be akin to a dormer window projecting rear of the existing roof resulting in a crown roof. The extension would have a maximum depth of 3.2m beyond the rear building line of the existing dwelling and a maximum width at ground floor level of 13.6m. The first floor dormer type element would create a crown roof form which would have a depth of 6.1 metres. The rear elevation of the extension would contain 2 Juliette balconies at first floor level.
- 3.4 The dormer window proposed for the front facing roof slope would have a pitched roof with a height of 1.8m and a maximum width of 2.6m. It would be set down from the ridge of the main roof by 0.15m and set up from the eaves by 0.7m and it would be set in from both sides of the roof. The pitch of the roof would match the angle of the main roof form of the dwelling.
- 3.5 A rooflight is proposed within the crown roof which would be created as a result of the proposed extensions. Two rooflights are proposed for the front facing roof slope of the existing dwelling and two rooflights are proposed for both side facing roof slopes.
- 3.6 It is proposed to alter an existing front roof projection from a hip to a front facing gable. The proposed gable would have a ridge height 4.8m – 0.5m higher than the existing hipped element. It would be set down from the height of the main roof by 0.5m, and an eaves height of approx. 2.8m. The new gable would have a window at first floor level in the front elevation.
- 3.7 A new front porch is proposed which would be positioned off-centre within the front elevation. The proposed porch would have a width of 3.5m and a flat roof form measuring a height of 2.5m.
- 3.8 Amended plans were received resulting in the following changes:
- Reduced width of roof extension above garage
  - Front dormer reduced in size
  - Alterations to fenestration detailing within the front elevation
  - Alterations to the design of the rear dormer/roof extension
  - The increase in ridge has been reduced down from 0.6m to 0.1m
  - The front gable has been set down from the main ridge
  - A street scene drawing was also provided

### **4 Consultation**

#### **4.1 Statutory Consultation**

##### **4.1.1 Chorleywood Parish Council: [Objection – CALL IN]**

The Committee had Objections to this application on the following grounds and wish to CALL IN, unless the Officer are minded to refuse planning permission.



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

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

In 2021 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, 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.

Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan (Referendum Version, August 2020): 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**

### **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 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) set out that development should not have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area and that extensions should respect the existing character of the dwelling, particularly with regard to roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors and materials. With regards to increases in ridge height the Design Criteria at Appendix 2 states that will be assessed on their own merits. Where roof forms are of a uniform style/height and appearance, it is unlikely that an increase in ridge height will be supported by the Council. In addition, development at first floor and above should be set in from flank boundaries by a minimum of 1.2 metres so as to prevent a terracing effect.
- 7.1.3 Policy 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan states that all development should seek to make a positive contribution to the 'street scene' by way of frontage, building line, scale and design.
- 7.1.4 In the vicinity of the application site, Quickley Lane is characterised by detached bungalows which are relatively uniform in character and design although some have undergone visible extensions and alterations, such as 77 Quickley Lane, and all the bungalows in this location are set on a higher land level than the highway. The frontages are relatively open and the narrow ridge widths and hipped roofs of the bungalows afford open views to the rear. Turning to Rendlesham Way there are examples of extensive extensions and alterations to similar style bungalows such as 5, 7 and 8 Rendlesham Way. There are also other examples at 32 and 34 Furze View which are located to the rear of the application site.
- 7.1.5 The proposed development would alter the appearance of the existing bungalow. The proposed roof extension would extend over the existing garage and would increase the bulk and massing at roof level due to the increase in width of the ridge and the creation of a crown roof form which has a depth of 6.1 metres. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Design Criteria at Appendix 2 generally discourages against such roof forms the current proposal is considered acceptable for the following reasons.
- 7.1.6 The proposal originally extended above the garage and up to the north-east elevation however amended plans were received to set this element in from the flank wall by 1.2m thus maintaining appropriate spacing to accord with the Design Criteria at Appendix 2. With respect to the opposite flank the proposed development would also result in a raise in the eaves height along the south west aspect of the main dwelling by 0.3m. This flank elevation is built in close proximity to the adjacent boundary. Given the scale of the proposed alteration, just 0.3m in additional height, and this flank would generally be single storey with the roof form sloping away from the common boundary it is considered that this additional height to the eaves on this side would not result in any terracing effect or result in detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.
- 7.1.7 The extension to the rear of the existing dwelling effectively consists of a single storey extension with first floor dormer window above. The extension would have a maximum depth from the rear building line of the original dwelling of 3.2m which is considered an acceptable depth in accordance with the Design Criteria at Appendix 2 which states that rear extensions to detached dwellings may have a depth of 4 metres. The originally submitted plans showed a larger rear dormer which covered the full rear roofslope. This has been amended during the assessment of the application to set it in from each flank by 1.1m. In addition, along the rear elevation the roof has been hipped to further reduce some

of the bulk and massing. Furthermore, this element is located to the rear and thus there would be limited visibility of this extension from Quickley Lane and therefore its impact on the wider street scene would be minimal.

- 7.1.8 With regards to the proposed dormer amended plans were received to reduce the overall size of this feature. The dormer within the front roofslope would be set down from the main ridge, in from both sides and back from the plane of the existing wall and would appear subordinate in in scale to the host dwelling in accordance with the Design Criteria as set out within Appendix 2. As dormers are common features within the street scene, it is not considered that the dormer proposed would result in demonstrable harm to the street scene.
- 7.1.9 Whilst the proposed rooflights would be visible from the street scene. They are not considered to be excessive in size and their quantity and would not appear excessively prominent within the street scene or to have any significant adverse impact on the character of the dwelling.
- 7.1.10 The Design Criteria in Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) states that applications for front extensions will be assessed on their individual merits but should not appear excessively prominent in the street scene. The proposed front facing hip-to-gable extension would not project any further forward than the existing front most building line and would be set down from the height of the main roof form. Given these circumstances it is not considered to appear excessively prominent in the street scene.
- 7.1.11 The proposed porch is considered to be modest in size and would be read as a subordinate feature within the principal elevation. Given the scale and siting of the proposed porch no objection is raised in regard to this element of the proposal. Other porches are also visible within the street scene.
- 7.1.12 It is accepted that the proposed development results in additional bulk and mass at roof level in comparison to the original bungalow however it is not considered that the proposed development would result in the dwelling becoming unduly prominent within the street scene so as to justify refusal of planning permission in this regard. It is also noted that there are varied roof extensions visible in the vicinity such as 5, 7 and 8 Rendlesham Way and 32 and 34 Furze View which are similar to that proposed under this current application. As such it is not considered that the proposed development would appear out of character. The proposed extensions would therefore be considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and Policy 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan.

## 7.2 Impact on amenity of neighbours

- 7.2.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should 'protect residential amenities by taking into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space'. Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not result in the loss of light to the windows of neighbouring properties nor allow overlooking, and should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties. Two storey development to the rear or dwellings should not intrude 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, although this principle is dependent on the spacing and relative positions of dwellings.
- 7.2.2 With regard to 77 Quickley Lane, this neighbour has undergone a hip-to-gable roof extension and the inclusion of a large rear dormer window. This neighbour also has single storey built form which runs parallel with the common boundary with the application site for a depth of approximately 11m. The ground floor windows within the rear elevation of this neighbour are set in from the common boundary by approximately 5m and the rear dormer window within the rear roofslope is set in approximately a further 1.5-2m. When drawing a

45 degree splay line from a point on the common boundary level with the main rear elevation of this neighbour the proposed dwelling would intrude by approximately 3m. Whilst there is an intrusion given the existing built form of this neighbour along the common boundary; the separation distance between the boundary and the ground floor windows and the suns orientation, it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would result in any loss of light towards the windows within the rear elevation of this neighbour or result in the dwelling becoming significantly overbearing.

- 7.2.3 With regard to 73 Quickley Lane, this neighbour is splayed away from the boundary and as such is set in from by 4.5m at the front increasing to 5.5m at the rear. There is also a detached garage located between the main dwelling of this neighbour and the common boundary. When drawing a 45 degree splay line from the boundary level with the rear elevation of this neighbour, there would be an intrusion of approximately 2 metres. Whilst there is an intrusion given the spacing between the extended dwelling and this neighbour there would be no intrusion of a splay line taken from the corner and it is not considered that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the residential amenity of this neighbour.
- 7.2.4 Rooflights are proposed within the flank roofslopes which would serve a mix of habitable and non-habitable rooms. Given their positioning and would be angles up to reflect the roofslope they would not facilitate the opportunity for overlooking. Notwithstanding this a condition is suggested to ensure the rooflights are positioned a minimum of 1.7m above internal floor level to prevent any overlooking.
- 7.2.5 The glazing proposed at both ground and first floor levels would primarily overlook the private amenity space of the application site. The application site does back onto the private amenity space of 3 Rendlesham Way however, whilst it is noted that there would only be a distance of approximately 12.5m from the rear elevation of the extended dwelling to the rear boundary; given that the land levels rise up towards the rear of the site and 3 Rendlesham Way is set on a higher land level it is not considered that any significant overlooking would occur towards the residential amenity of this neighbour.
- 7.2.6 The Juliette balconies proposed for the rear elevation of the dormer window would not provide any platform beyond the rear facing wall of the dormer and they would be set in from both sides of the dwelling. Given these circumstances, they would not be considered to result in any significant overlooking towards either adjacent neighbour.
- 7.2.7 The glazing proposed within the principal elevation would overlook the frontage of the application and there are no neighbouring properties located directly opposite the site and as such no overlooking would occur from these windows.
- 7.2.8 The existing dwelling has a pebble-dashed render exterior and tiled roof. The submitted application form states that the extended dwelling would have Weber render and composite cladding exterior with roof tiles to match existing apart from a grey aluminium flat roof above the porch. Whilst there would be a change in appearance to the character of the original dwelling, it is not considered to result in demonstrable harm to the street scene or wider area.
- 7.2.9 In summary, given the site circumstances and subject to conditions, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any significant harm to neighbouring properties and is acceptable in accordance with Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013).

### 7.3 Amenity Space Provision for future occupants

- 7.3.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should take into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of amenity and garden space. Section 3 (Amenity

Space) of Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document provide indicative levels of amenity/garden space provision and set out that a four bedroom dwelling should provide 105sqm of amenity space. The application site would retain a rear garden amenity space of approximately 180sqm which would exceed the indicative standards and is considered acceptable for future occupiers of the dwelling.

#### 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 this application in accordance with Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies document. National Planning Policy requires Local Authorities to ensure that a protected species survey is undertaken for applications where biodiversity may be affected prior to the determination of a planning application. 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. The site is not in or located adjacent to a designated wildlife site. However, given the nature of the proposed development involving the demolition of the existing bungalow and informative will be added advising the applicant on what to do should bats be present on site.

#### 7.5 Trees and Landscaping

7.5.1 The proposed development would not result in the loss of any trees within the application site.

#### 7.6 Highways, Access and Parking

7.6.1 Core Strategy Policy CP10 (adopted October 2011) requires development to provide a safe and adequate means of access and to make adequate provision for all users, including car parking. Policy DM13 the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013) states that development should make provision for parking in accordance with the Parking Standards set out at Appendix 5 of said document.

7.6.2 The extended dwelling would contain four bedrooms which the Parking Standards state should provide three off-street parking spaces. The proposed dwelling would have an integral garage however the width of the garage entrance is 2 metres and thus is not considered wide enough to accommodate a parked car. Highways Officer were verbally consulted and recommended that in order to be an effective storage space for cars new garages should measure at least 6 metres long by 3 metres wide, thus the proposal would result in the loss of one existing space. The existing driveway would provide two spaces. The proposal would result in a shortfall of one space. Whilst there is a shortfall, it is not considered that the shortfall is unacceptable. This part of Quickley Lane is served by a service road which could facilitate on-street parking and is not the main thoroughfare. Thus it is not considered that the shortfall of parking would have a demonstrable impact on highway safety.

### **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: 01 REV-G, 02, 03 REV-F, 04, 05 REV-H and 06 REV-C.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies PSP2, 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.

- C3 Before any building operations above ground level hereby permitted are commenced, samples and details of the proposed external materials 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 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 rooflights hereby permitted within the north-east and south-west flank roofslopes shall be positioned at a minimum internal cill height of 1.7m above the internal floor level.

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).

## 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. If your development is CIL liable, even if you have been granted exemption from the levy, please be advised that before commencement of any works it is a requirement under Regulation 67 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (As Amended) that CIL form 6 (Commencement Notice) must be completed, returned and acknowledged by Three Rivers District Council before building works start. Failure to do so will mean you lose the right to payment by instalments (where applicable), and a surcharge will be imposed. However, please note that a Commencement Notice is not required for residential extensions IF relief has been granted.

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. 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.

- 12 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.
- 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 Local Planning Authority suggested modifications to the development during the course of the application and the applicant and/or their agent submitted amendments which result in a form of development that 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](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).