

## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 25 MAY 2023

### PART I - DELEGATED

**9. 23/0427/FUL – Two storey front, side and rear extensions and loft conversion including roof extensions, insertion of roof lights at 10 GROSVENOR ROAD, NORTHWOOD, HA6 3HJ**

Parish: Batchworth Community Council                      Ward: Moor Park and Eastbury  
Expiry of Statutory Period: 29.05.2023 (agreed extension)      Case Officer: Lauren Edwards

Recommendation: That Planning Permission be Granted.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: The application was called in by Batchworth Community Council, unless Officers were minded to recommend refusal of the application on the grounds that the submitted scheme has not overcome the previous reason for refusal or appeal decision.

#### **1 Relevant Planning**

1.1 8/860/87 – Two storey side extension including garage, two storey rear extension and garage conversion, vehicular access – Permitted.

1.2 98/0995 – Single storey side and rear extensions – Permitted.

1.3 22/0720/FUL - Two storey front, side and rear extensions and loft conversion including roof extensions and insertion of roof lights – Refused for the following reasons:

*R1 By virtue of the overall increase in the depth of the flanks together with the introduction of a crown roof and the design of the resultant dwelling, the proposal would result in an excessive increase in the overall bulk and massing of the dwelling which would appear unduly prominent and visually obtrusive within the streetscene. The proposed development would result in the host dwelling appearing unduly prominent within the site and street scene and would be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013).*

*R2 The proposed development by virtue of the cumulative impact arising from the increased depth, height, siting and overall massing of the resultant flank adjacent to No.12 Grosvenor Road would result in an oppressive, overbearing and visually intrusive form of development to the detriment of the amenities of the occupants of No.12. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).*

**The above refusal was appealed (APP/P1940/D/22/3307177) and dismissed in an appeal decision dated 13.01.2023. However, the inspector only upheld the appeal on the grounds of R1. They did not find the proposed development to be unacceptable on the grounds of neighbouring amenity impacts (R2).**

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

2.1 The application site is roughly rectangular in shape and is located on the southern side of Grosvenor Road, Northwood. The application dwelling is a two storey detached dwelling with a catslide roof feature to the side. The dwelling is built of brick with partially white painted beige pebble dash to some walls. The dwelling has existing single storey rear projections.

- 2.2 Land levels slope upwards towards the rear of the site with a patio adjacent to the rear elevation stepping to an area laid as lawn. To the front is a block paved driveway and areas of soft landscaping.
- 2.3 The neighbour at No.8 is a two storey detached dwelling which has existing single storey side and rear extensions. This neighbour sits at a slightly lower land level to the application dwelling.
- 2.4 The neighbour at No.12 is a two storey detached dwelling which has undertaken a number of two storey extensions. This neighbour is sited at a slightly higher land level to the application dwelling.

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

- 3.1 This application seeks full planning permission for two storey front, side and rear extensions and loft conversion including roof extensions, insertion of roof lights.
- 3.2 The Officer's report pursuant to 22/0720/FUL described the proposed development as:

*The proposed development includes a two storey infill extension to the front where the existing elevation is 'L' shaped (3.2m deep and 5.3m wide). A first floor front infill extension is also proposed to the western side of the front projection (depth of 5.4m and width of 2.3m). First floor infill extensions are also proposed to rear to both sides of the existing first floor rear projection (3.4m to the east and 2m to the west). As a result of these extensions a crown roof would be created which would extend over two storey front and first floor rear extensions to encompass all the two storey elements (both existing and proposed). A portion of the existing single storey rear projection which accommodates the dining room would be retained in addition to a section of the existing garage where it extends beyond the existing two storey flank. The crown roof would be in line with the highest part of the existing ridge.*

*The proposed crown roof would also facilitate the creation of loft accommodation which would be served by front, side and rear rooflights.*

*Additional flank windows are proposed in both side elevations. A central full height glazing feature is proposed within the front elevation.*

- 3.3 The current application incorporates the following amendments to the above scheme:
- The proposed two storey front elevation would be stepped such that the 2.7m wide section would be set back 1m from the main front elevation. This element would also be set down 350mm (0.35m) from the main ridge.
  - The glazing within the front elevation above the front door has been reduced such that there is now a 0.7m high section of brickwork between the door and the cill of the window.

## **4 Consultation**

### **4.1 Statutory Consultation**

- 4.1.1 National Grid: [No response received]
- 4.1.2 Batchworth Community Council: [Objection]

*Batchworth Community Council (BCC) have carefully reviewed the current application including in the context of the earlier refused application (22/0720/FUL) that was also*

*refused on appeal (22/0040/REF). Alongside this we have considered both the original Pre-App (March 2022) and importantly the subsequent Pre-App in March 2023.*

*Whilst Batchworth Community Council (BCC) acknowledges that the current application has some small/minor amendments and changes when compared with the application 22/0720/FUL we are not of the opinion that all the points raised by the Inspector at the appeal or the advice received in the most recent Pre-App have been accounted for and incorporated.*

*Therefore, from BCC's perspective this application still has not addressed the earlier concerns as follows:*

*1. This application does not take into account the reasons for the refusal of Application 22/0720/FUL and is largely, to all intent and purpose, significantly the same in terms of information and detail. The limited changes incorporated do not account sufficiently for the reasons for the previous refusal. In that refusal the TRDC Planning Officer clearly stated the following:*

*“By virtue of the overall increase in the depth of the flanks together with the introduction of a crown roof and the design of the resultant dwelling, the proposal would result in an excessive increase in the overall bulk and massing of the dwelling which would appear unduly prominent and visually obtrusive within the street scene. The proposed development would result in the host dwelling appearing unduly prominent within the site and street scene.*

*The proposed development by virtue of the cumulative impact arising from the increased depth, height, siting and overall massing of the resultant flank adjacent to No.12 Grosvenor Road would result in an oppressive, overbearing and visually intrusive form of development to the detriment of the amenities of the occupants of No.12.”*

*2. Similarly, the reasons for the appeal refusal have not been accounted for sufficiently and many of the same issues remain. These are detailed and set out clearly in the Appeal Notification and should be accounted for in full.*

*3. The revised elevations still detract from the street scene including the loss of items such as the chimney stacks.*

*4. The overall increase in the depth of the flanks walls will continue to result in an excessive increase in the overall massing of the dwelling.*

*5. The introduction of a crown roof, albeit amended slightly, continues to lead to the massing of the property appearing excessively prominent.*

*6. Overall, these proposals will be, as previously described, visually obtrusive & prominent within the immediate street scene.*

*7. All of the aforementioned and the three additional skylights in the roof to the rear, will also have a negative effect on the privacy of the adjoining property (#12)*

*8. Finally, we are of the opinion that the examples provided of similar forms of construction in Grosvenor Road, contained within the Design & Access statement do not give a full understanding and review of the street. As always, each application needs to be considered on its own merits. The examples provided are the exception to the road & neighbourhood and do not account for the impact that the proposed design & scale of the application will have on the adjoining properties and on this individual site (both #8 & #12).*

*Accounting for all of our comments above Batchworth Community Council would ask that this application is called in for a decision by the TRDC Planning Committee unless the Planning Officers are minded to refuse.*

## **4.2 Public/Neighbour Consultation**

4.2.1 Neighbours consulted: 5

4.2.2 Responses received: 2 (objections)

4.2.3 Summary of responses received:

- Loss of light
- Overlooking
- Impact on privacy
- Scheme not materially different to the previously refused/appeal scheme

4.2.4 Site Notice: Not required

4.2.5 Press notice Not required

## **5 Reason for Delay**

5.1 No delay.

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

6.1 Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise as set out within S38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990).

### **6.2 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.

### **6.3 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, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

## 6.4 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 the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality

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 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.

7.1.2 Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document outlines that two storey extensions may be positioned on the flank boundary, provided that the first floor element is set in 1.2m. This distance must be increased in low density areas or where the extension would have an adverse effect on an adjoining property. First floor front extensions will be assessed on their own individual merits but should not appear unduly prominent in the streetscene.

7.1.3 Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD outlines that crown roofs are generally discouraged in favour of more traditional roof forms as they can be indicative of the excessive bulk and massing of extensions.

7.1.4 The proposed extensions previously considered via 22/0720/FUL were found to be unacceptable in this respect. The Officer report set out:

*The proposed extensions would be set in a minimum of 1.2m from the flank boundaries with spacing increasing to a maximum of 1.4m to the western flank at the front. Notwithstanding this the overall scale of the proposed extensions is considered to be excessive and as a result unduly prominent within the streetscene.*

*The eastern flank would increase in depth by 6m and the western flank by 7.6m. Both elevations would appear as uninterrupted and excessively deep flank which is further exacerbated by the bulk and massing from the creation of a crown roof. There are some examples of crown roofs in the locality but not comparably at this scale. The proposed extensions fail to achieve any visual subservience to the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling is a two storey property of a traditional form with a pitched roof, catslide roof feature*

*and two storey gable projection. Whilst the application dwelling has undertaken extensions in the past these appear subordinate in scale to the size of the host dwelling. The proposed extensions which project in line with the existing two storey front feature would erode the irregular plan form and result in a boxy appearance which would be further exacerbated in mass with the introduction of a large crown roof which would extend over all two storey elements. The uninterrupted mass of the building would be excessive in its overall scale and whilst there would be some visual relief to the front elevation achieved by the front bay the form of this element becomes subsumed by the proposed extensions. Whereas this feature currently appears as the dominant front feature the scale of the two storey infill elements and crown roof would now overwhelm the contribution that this feature makes. The front glazing feature also competes visually with the front gable feature and results in vertical emphasis to the front elevation even though the eaves height would remain the same.*

*Whilst spacing would be retained to the boundaries the overall scale of the extensions subsume the form of the existing dwelling and fail to respond to the character of the streetscene. Whilst it is noted that there are examples of dwellings within Grosvenor Road which have undertaken extensions including the creation of crown roofs these are not on a scale comparable to that now proposed where no attempt has been made to achieve an visual relief to the boxy appearance of the resultant dwelling with deep uninterrupted flanks and an unduly large crown roof which is indicative of the excessive bulk and mass of the extensions.*

*The proposed rooflights are not considered, in themselves, to appear incongruous however their overall size and number would exacerbate the prominence of the excessive scale of the crown roof.*

- 7.1.5 The findings of the LPA were upheld within the appeal inspectors decision (APP/P1940/D/22/3307177). Within their decision the Inspector set out:

*The host is a detached two storey property which is set back from Grosvenor Road, behind a front garden. In common with those nearby properties in a broadly similar style, it has a prominent two storey projecting gable with bay windows typical of its era. That, along with recessed and set down single storey and two storey sections to the sides, breaks up the building's mass.*

*Consequently, like most nearby properties, including those which have been significantly extended, it presents an articulated appearance in the streetscene.*

*The scheme would not extend beyond the outermost reaches of the host's footprint, nor exceed its maximum height. Whilst the dwelling's size would increase considerably, given the varied proportions of nearby properties that in itself would not be harmful.*

*However, the resultant dwelling would have an almost straight front face and flanks. That lack of any significant articulation would give it a very rectilinear mass, which would be at odds with the area's prevailing character, and it would appear bulky and excessively dominant in the streetscene.*

*Given its elevated position, the proposed crown roof would not be very noticeable from Grosvenor Road, and there are other such roofs nearby, such as at Nos 1, 4, 5, 6 and 9. However, those dwellings, and the other examples of significantly extended dwellings at 18 and 19 Grosvenor Road, generally present greater articulation in the streetscene than would be the case here.*

*The proposed front-facing, ground to eaves, glazing serving the hallway, would be of a contemporary appearance, but in this prominent position it would jar and compete with the style and design of the host's bay windows. Whilst there are occasional examples of floor*

*to ceiling windows in the wider area as demonstrated in the Design Access Statement, here it would significantly erode the visual dominance of that distinctive architectural feature, and it would add to the harm that I have found by reason of the scheme's bulk.*

*For the above reasons, the scheme's form and style would significantly harm the area's prevailing character and appearance. It would thus conflict with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Three Rivers Core Strategy 2011 ('TRCS'), and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Three Rivers Development Management Policies Local Development Document 2013 ('TRDMP').*

- 7.1.6 The appeal inspector found that whilst there was no in principle objection to the proposed increase in size, the resultant dwelling would have resulted in unarticulated straight faces and a very rectilinear mass. As such it would overall appear bulky and excessively dominant in the streetscene. The overall scale of the crown roof by virtue of the lack of articulation would not be comparable to those in the locality. Additionally the glazing within the front elevation was found to compete with the style and design of the host dwelling and would have added to the harm found by reason of the scheme's bulk.
- 7.1.7 The proposed scheme now includes a stepped front and eastern flank together with alterations to the roof form. The proposed two storey front/side extension would be set back 1m from the front elevation for a 2.7m wide section. It is noted that the western and rear elevations would remain flat faced with no articulation in the crown roof. However overall the step in the front elevation together with the 0.35m set down of the two storey front extension would break up the front and eastern side elevations such that there would now be much improved articulation of these elevations. Whilst a crown roof would remain the overall scale and size of that now proposed is more in keeping with others evident within the locality and the broken up massing of the north eastern corner of the building would achieve improved visual interest of these elevations and a subservient appearance of the two storey front/side extension. Overall it is no longer considered that the proposed extensions would represent a 'rectilinear mass' and the resultant dwelling would not appear excessively bulky within the streetscene.
- 7.1.8 In respect of the glazing within the front elevation this has now been reduced such that there is a 0.7m section of brick work between the upper part of the front door and the cill of the window. This provides relief to the previously proposed floor to ceiling glazing and introduces a less contemporary appearance of this element. Overall it is no longer considered that the fenestration detailing would compete with the existing bay, rather it would sympathetically respond to the character of the host dwelling.
- 7.1.9 In summary it is considered that the scheme, as currently submitted, overcomes the previous reason for refusal and findings of the associated appeal decision., Overall it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the host dwelling, street scene or area and the proposal would be acceptable 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).

## 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 loss of light to the windows of neighbouring properties nor allow overlooking and should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties.
- 7.2.2 The scheme submitted via 22/0720/FUL considered that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity as set out below:

*Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD outlines that two storey rear and side extensions should not generally intrude a 45 degree splay line drawn across the rear from the point on the boundary level with the rear wall of the adjacent property. This principle is dependent on the spacing and relative positions of properties and consideration will be given to the juxtaposition of properties, land levels and positions of windows and development on neighbouring properties.*

*The proposed first floor infill extension would not intrude a 45 degree splay line with the neighbour at No.8 when taken from the point on the boundary level with their rear elevation. The proposed first floor rear extension would intrude a 45 degree line when taken from the point on the boundary level with the rear elevation of the neighbour at No.12 at its set back point by 2m. However it is acknowledged that the existing flank also partially intrudes a 45 degree line and that the proposed extension would not intrude from the two storey projection of this neighbour.*

*The proposed extensions would not intrude a 45 degree splay line with the neighbour at No.8. It is acknowledged that the proposed development would result in additional built form adjacent to this neighbour in addition to additional overall massing of the roof form. However the proposed first floor infill extension would not project beyond the rear of this neighbour and whilst the front element would marginally extend beyond the recessed front elevation of the neighbour it would remain set in from the boundary and would not extend beyond the single storey front extension at this neighbour. As such it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact to No.8 by virtue of an unacceptable overbearing impact or loss of light.*

*It is acknowledged that the proposed extension would not intrude a 45 degree splay line from the point on the shared boundary level with the two storey rear extension at No.12 however would intrude from the point on the boundary level with the recessed rear elevation which is closest to the boundary with the application site. It is also acknowledged that the existing dwelling would marginally intrude a 45 degree splay line. Nevertheless as existing the majority of the first floor adjacent to this neighbour has a catslide roof form with the deepest section set in from the boundary and set down from the main ridge. The proposed development would result in an increase to the depth of the flank closest to this neighbour by 3.4m at the rear and 3.2m at the front. Additionally the eaves height along this flank would be raised to the highest point as existing for the whole depth of the flank with additional overall massing resulting from the crown roof. It is not considered that the proposed development would result in unacceptable loss of light owing to the south facing nature of the properties on this side of Grosvenor Road. However by virtue of the overall increase in bulk and massing resulting from the development it is considered that cumulatively the height, depth and overall scale of the extensions would result in an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development as experienced from the private amenity space of No.12.*

*The proposed first floor flank windows would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and top level opening only and the flank rooflights conditioned to have a cill height of at least 1.7m above floor level in order to prevent unacceptable overlooking.*

*In summary, the development would result in unacceptable harm to the neighbouring amenity of No.12 Grosvenor Road and is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD in this regard.*

7.2.3 However within the appeal decision dated 13.01.2023 (APP/P1940/D/22/3307177) the appeal inspector concluded:

*“.....having regard to the particular site circumstances here, whilst the scheme would intrude into the 45 degree splay, it would not conflict with the thrust of TRCS Policy CP12 and*



*TRDMP Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 which set out that development is expected to protect residential amenities and to take into consideration their effect on neighbours with regard to matters including outlook.”*

- 7.2.4 The scheme now submitted proposes a reduction in the overall level of built form, particularly adjacent to No.12 where harm was previously identified by the LPA. As such the submitted scheme is considered to be an improvement to that which was previously considered to be acceptable to the inspector within their appeal decision (APP/P1940/D/22/3307177).
- 7.2.5 The proposed first floor flank windows would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and top level opening only. Additionally the flank rooflights would be conditioned to have a cill height of at least 1.7m above floor level in order to prevent unacceptable levels of overlooking.
- 7.2.6 In summary, the proposed development would not result in any adverse impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring dwelling so as to justify refusal of the application and the development would therefore be acceptable 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).

### 7.3 Highways & Parking

- 7.3.1 Core Strategy Policy CP10 requires development to provide a safe and adequate means of access and to make adequate provision for all users, including car parking. Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies document set out parking standards.
- 7.4 Appendix 5 outlines that dwellings with four or more bedrooms should provide 3 on-site parking spaces. The existing site frontage can only accommodate two cars and as such there is an existing shortfall of one space. As a result of the proposed development there would be no requirement for additional parking and therefore the existing shortfall would remain. Given this is an existing situation that would not be exacerbated, no objection is raised.

### 7.5 Rear Garden Amenity Space

- 7.5.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should take into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space.
- 7.5.2 Appendix 2 requires 147sqm to be provided for a six bedroom dwelling. The application site would retain approx. 350sqm of amenity space and as such would comply with Appendix 2 in this respect

### 7.6 Trees & Landscape

- 7.6.1 Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD sets out that development proposals should seek to retain trees and other landscape and nature conservation features, and that proposals should demonstrate that trees will be safeguarded and managed during and after development in accordance with the relevant British Standards.
- 7.6.2 The proposed development would not require the removal of any trees nor is considered to result in any harm to others.

### 7.7 Biodiversity

- 7.7.1 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.

- 7.7.2 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. Given that the proposed development includes work affecting the roofspace an informative will be added to ensure the applicant is mindful of the action to take should bats be discovered.

## **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: A-01 Rev A, A-02 Rev A, A-03 Rev A, A-04 Rev A, A-05 Rev A, A-06 Rev A (East and West side elevations), A-06A (Sections) and B-01 Rev A

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

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

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

- C4 Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the first floor flank windows shall be fitted with purpose made obscured glazing and shall be top level opening only at 1.7m above the floor level of the room in which the window is installed. The window shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

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

- C5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any other revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows or similar openings [other than those expressly authorised by this permission] shall be constructed in the side elevations or roof slopes of the extension 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 The flank rooflights hereby permitted 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) - 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. 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 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.

- I3 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in its consideration of this planning application, in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The development maintains/improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.
- I4 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).