

THREE RIVERS DISTRICT COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, on Thursday 19 February 2015 from 7.30pm to 9.53pm.

Present: Councillors, Chris Whately-Smith (Chairman), Phil Brading, Terry Dos-Ramos, Peter Getkahn, Raj Khiroya, David Major, Debbie Morris, Reena Ranger and Ann Shaw OBE.

Officers: Claire Westwood, Kimberley Rowley, Suzanne O'Brien, Terence Flynn, Sarah Haythorpe and Helen Wailing.

Also in attendance: Councillors Eric Bishop, Kemal Butt, Paula Hiscocks, Wendy Jordan, Heather Kenison, Angela Roberts, Ralph Sangster and Keith Williams and Chorleywood Parish Councillor Jane White, Sarratt Parish Councillor Anthony Soothill, Watford Rural Parish Councillor Pam Hames and Abbots Langley Parish Councillors Owen Roe and Jean Bowman.

About 50 members of the public.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Marilyn Butler, Chris Lloyd and Len Tippen.

PC104/14 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 January 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendments:

Minute 90/14, first paragraph, second line the wording to read "one in a group of oak trees in the garden".

Minute PC99/14, Page 28, seventh paragraph, line six before the word half insert the words "It was estimated about"

Minute PC99/14, Page 29, first paragraph, in the second sentence after 28m add "for two, two storey dwellings, but as there were three storey dwellings it would only be 26m which would be an inadequate distance." Delete the sentence "Two parking spaces for the new homes was not sufficient."

PC105/14 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

The Committee noted that the application at Agenda item 14 (14/2478/FUL – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two detached dwellings with integral garages and accommodation within the roof space and associated works including alterations to land levels and vehicular access at 2 THE CLIMB, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 4DX for Mr & Mrs Sheldon) had been withdrawn.

PC106/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor David Major declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 17 (14/2495/FUL – Demolition of no. 18 Gallows Hill Lane and construction of four detached dwellings on land to the rear with associated access, landscaping, parking and alterations to existing access at 18 GALLOWS HILL LANE, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WD5 0DA for Thorne Barton Estates Ltd) as a member of

the Abbots Langley Parish Council Planning Committee and left the meeting during the consideration of this application.

Councillor Heather Kenison declared that on agenda item 8 (14/2106/FUL – Demolition of existing dwelling and garage and construction of detached dwelling with lower ground floor level and raised terraces and construction of detached garage to front of dwelling, including alterations to landscaping and drive at CHERRY HILL COTTAGE, TROUT RISE, LOUDWATER, WD3 4JR for Mr and Mrs Patel) she would be speaking to the Committee in her role as the Local Ward Councillor.

PC107/14 Consideration of Objections and Confirmation of Three Rivers (10 and 12 Berks Hill, Chorleywood) Tree Preservation Order 2014

The Landscape Officer reported the recommendation was to retain these substantial trees on the Station estate and to confirm the order.

Councillor Peter Getkahn, seconded by Councillor Phil Brading, moved the recommendation that the objection be noted but that the Three Rivers (10 and 12 Berks Hill, Chorleywood) Tree Preservation Order 2014 be confirmed without modification.

On being put to the Committee the motion to confirm the order was declared CARRIED the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:-

that the objection be noted but that the Three Rivers (10 and 12 Berks Hill, Chorleywood) Tree Preservation Order 2014 be confirmed without modification.

PC108/14 14/1621/HSC – Hazardous Substance Consent: Storage of fuel oil (up to 148.75 tonnes) and sludge gas (up to 9.64 tonnes) at MAPLE LODGE SEWAGE WORKS, MAPLE LODGE CLOSE, MAPLE CROSS for Thames Water Utilities Limited

Councillor Ann Shaw had been anxious about what had been happening until now on the site.

The Planning Officer advised the regulations had recently changed and aspects of the site now required further regulation and control. The quantities stored on the site were just caught in these new regulations.

Councillor Ann Shaw hoped the regulations would be maintained in the future and asked if there was a system to check this.

The Planning Officer advised tighter controls by the Health and Safety Executive and Environment Agency were required to comply with COMAH regulations as with other similar sites. She advised she thought there must be compliance checks as part of these regulations to ensure the storage was done correctly. The Planning Officer said the Health and Safety Executive and Environment Agency had stringent controls in place and the new regulations had warranted the submission of this application. The change to the regulations had been due to incidents such as Buncefield.

Councillor Ann Shaw asked if Officers could contact the relevant authorities to ask what the systems of checking would be and to ensure that the site continued to meet all required policies.

Councillor Ann Shaw, seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya, moved the recommendation that hazardous substance consent be granted subject to conditions. She also moved, seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya, that Officers contact the Health and Safety Executive and Environment Agency to ask how they will monitor the site.

On being put to the Committee the motions that hazardous substance consent be granted subject to conditions and that officers contact the Health and Safety Executive and Environment Agency to ask how they will monitor the site was declared CARRIED the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CONSENT BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions:-

C1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

TRDC 01, MAPLS1ZZ-SPL-001 REV A.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, in the proper interests of planning in accordance with the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992.

C2 The hazardous substances shall not be kept or used other than in accordance with particulars provided on the application form, nor outside the areas marked for storage of the substances on the plans which formed part of the application.

Reason: In the interests of safety with respect to surrounding properties in accordance with the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992 (as amended).

Informatives:

I1 The applicant/developer is advised to contact Osi Ivowi on 01908 302591 in order to ensure that any necessary consents are obtained and that the works comply with the Canal and River Trust "Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal and River Trust.

I2 Due to the presence of National Grid apparatus in proximity to the application site, the Applicant should contact National Grid before any works are carried out to ensure National Grid apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works. Further 'Essential Guidance' can be found on the National Grid website at www.nationalgrid.com or by contacting National Grid on 0800688588.

Outside of the decision for 14/1621/HSC the Committee requested that officers contact HSE and the Environment Agency to ask how they monitor the site.

PC109/14 14/2106/FUL – Demolition of existing dwelling and garage and construction of detached dwelling with lower ground floor level and raised terraces and construction of detached garage to front of dwelling, including alterations to landscaping and drive at CHERRY HILL COTTAGE, TROUT RISE, LOUDWATER, WD3 4JR for Mr and Mrs Patel

The Planning Officer reported that one neighbour objection had been received objecting on the grounds that the development would be of an increased height and massing, more visible in the streetscene and the design of the new dwelling would not be in keeping with the Conservation Area and was better suited to a more urban environment.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35 (B), Mr Murphy spoke against the application and Mr Cowards spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Ann Shaw said this application was for the demolition of a McNamara style house in the Loudwater Conservation Area. She did not agree that the dwelling was unsympathetic to the area. She noted the front door was at the side of the building but the orientation was not a reason to demolish the house. The estate should be protected to ensure the character of the Conservation Area is continued. If the building was demolished it would undermine the principles of having the Conservation Area. The houses in the area had a particular character which should be retained. She moved, seconded by Councillor Debbie Morris, that the application be refused on the grounds that the existing dwelling made a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, there was no justification for its demolition, the proposed replacement by virtue of its design, bulk and massing would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.

Councillor Debbie Morris said the Loudwater estate appraisal document stated that Troutstream Way and Troutstream Rise were at the heart of the estate. The character of the McNamara houses contributed to the estate with their rustic windows and roofs. She made reference to the Conservation Officer's comments on Page 13, Paragraph 4.1.1 which stated that the house was one of the earlier buildings on the estate from the 1920s. The new dwelling would include a number of features which would not be in keeping with the character of the area. On Page 17 and 18 of the agenda papers reference was made on the design and impact on streetscene and Conservation Area but there was no comment on the impact on the surrounding properties.

Local Ward Councillor Heather Kenison endorsed the comments made. If the demolition was allowed it could allow for further applications to be submitted which would change the character of the Loudwater estate. The application did state that the existing features would be included in the dwelling. McNamara style houses had features which should be protected including the roof features, chimneys, rendering and leaded windows.

The Chairman stated that the site visit and the plans had indicated a significant increase in bulk for the new dwelling.

On being put to the Committee the motion that planning permission be refused on the grounds that the existing dwelling made a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, there was no justification for its demolition, and the proposed replacement by virtue of design, bulk and massing would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area was declared CARRIED the voting being 8 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:-

That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reason: (the final wording having been agreed by Members following the Committee meeting):-

- R1 The existing dwelling makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Loudwater Estate Conservation Area. It has not been demonstrated that there is any justification for its demolition and the proposed replacement dwelling by virtue of its design, bulk and massing would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Loudwater Estate Conservation Area. The proposed demolition of the existing dwelling and replacement dwelling would therefore be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the Loudwater Estate Conservation Area Appraisal (June 2013).

Informative:

- I1 In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012, the Local Planning Authority has considered the application in a positive and proactive manner, however, 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.

PC110/14 14/2240/RSP – Part Retrospective: Single storey rear extension and addition of rooflights to existing rear projection at PENNYFIELDS, THE GREEN, SARRATT, HERTS, WD3 6AT for Mr Roy Fidmont

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35 (B), Mr Dudley spoke against the application.

Sarratt Parish Councillor Anthony Soothill said the Parish Council had objected to the application for three reasons. It would intrude the 45 degree splay line with the neighbouring property, the kitchen window at Byways would look out onto an 8m high wall and the property would only have garden space of 60sqm when the indicative amenity space for a 2 bedroom property was 63sqm. This would fail to meet Council standards. He said there had been non compliance with conditions on a previous application with regard to the parking at the front of the property and an enforcement case had been opened.

Local Ward Councillor Heather Kenison had concerns regarding the impact on Byways. She drew attention to Paragraph 7.3.3 of the report and how the hipped roof and roof height would impact on the garden at Byways.

The Planning Officer advised that the height of the extension had been reduced by 0.6 to 3.7m and would be set in slightly from the side elevation.

Councillor Debbie Morris said 75% of the plot would be developed if the application was granted. The assessment did not take into account the percentage of the plot now developed. The site was in a Conversation Area and there would be demonstrable harm. The amenity space would be 3sqm below the required standard. The Planning Officer said that 63sqm was a guideline.

Councillor Reena Ranger said the dwelling was not only within the Conservation Area but also within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The extension would be contrary to Policy DM2 and was disproportionate in size. It would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt. The design and scale did not preserve or enhance the area.

The Chairman of the Committee said the application had been deferred at the previous meeting to ask the applicant to reduce the height which had been undertaken and now the Committee were introducing new criteria.

Councillor Reena Ranger noted the reduction in roof height but the points raised were still valid and did apply.

Councillor Ann Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Peter Getkahn, that the application be DEFERRED for a site visit.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:-

That the application be DEFERRED for a site visit.

PC1111/14 14/2333/FUL – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling at 7 ASKEW ROAD, MOOR PARK, HERTFORDSHIRE, HA6 2JE for Mr and Mrs B Patel

The Planning Officer reported that a letter in support of the application had been received from Martin Robeson Planning Practice who represented the applicant and would be speaking in support of the application at tonight's meeting.

Officers were also aware that a formal complaint in relation to the application has been received. This had been dealt with separately by the Director of Community and Environment Services and should not affect the consideration of this application by Members tonight.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35 (B), Mr Midgeley spoke against the application and Mr Robeson spoken in support of the application.

Councillor Ann Shaw moved, seconded by Councillor Peter Getkahn, the recommendation that planning permission be granted subject to conditions. She had read all the documents and taken into account all the information provided but she could see no any adverse impact on the Green Belt. The spaces between the neighbouring houses would be bigger than they were now and it would not impact on the Moor Park Conservation Area.

Councillor Ralph Sangster said there were wider issues to consider. This development was within the Green Belt which was an important and valuable asset. Green Belt policy showed a requirement to protect it from inappropriate development. A substantial amount of the District was designated Green Belt and this should not be undermined. The Committee should reject this application or face receiving further applications. There was uncertainty on the size of the footprint as detailed in Paragraph 7.1.9 of the report. If the proposal was greater than 40% then consideration must be given to reject or revise the plans to make it appropriate within the Green Belt.

The Planning Officer advised that the figure of 40% was a guidance figure and other factors needed to be considered. The ridge height would be narrower and there would be lower gable ends.

Councillor Reena Ranger said the dwelling would not be in line with the neighbours and would be set back 1.5m. The proposed dwelling exceeded Green Belt guidelines. The Planning Officer advised that the report set out on Page 36 the previous application details and decisions. Lengthy discussion had taken place on the application. Consideration of percentages was one aspect when considering what constituted a materially larger dwelling, however, there was a lot of other aspects to consider.

Councillor Peter Getkahn said there would be plenty of room between the two properties and he could not find anything wrong with the application.

Councillor Debbie Morris said there was confusion regarding the tests applied. This proposed dwelling would be materially larger and would exceed the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy DM2 and would be larger than the current dwelling and should not be allowed.

The Planning Officer noted the comments made but the situation was that an Appeal Inspector would have due regard to policies and overarching criteria to the NPPF with regard to harm to the Green Belt. However, there would be a requirement to demonstrate actual harm to the openness of the Green Belt, rather than solely basing this harm on a percentage/calculation. Regard must be had to the overall impact of the development considering aspects such as the increased boundary distances, design (gables, hip ends) and the proposed reduction in ridge height as part of the recommendation.

Councillor Phil Brading said the dwelling proposed made the plot width less than the existing house and would have less significance on No.9. The overall impact would reduce when compared to the existing dwelling. The 45 degree splay line could not substantiate a reason for refusal, the dwelling would be set further back and the roof hipped. The impact would be no greater than what existed now and could possibly be less.

Local Ward Councillor Kemal Butt queried the details on the footprint, the brick course and why the porch had not been included in the calculations. He was concerned about receiving more applications for development in the Green Belt. The increase in depth, height and bulk and impact on privacy on the neighbours should be considered as reasons for refusal.

On being put to the Committee the motion that planning permission be granted subject to conditions was declared CARRIED the voting being 6 For, 3 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

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:

5194-A-103-A (Site Location Plan)

5194/102A-D (Location Plan, Block Plan and Site Plan)

5194/A104-A (Existing Building Elevations)

5194/A105-C (Existing and Proposed Street Elevations)

5194/A100-L (Proposed Floor Plans and Sections)

5194/A101-H (Proposed Elevations)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning and in the interests of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area, Green Belt and locality and residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policies CP1, CP9, CP10, CP11 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policies DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2006).

C3 Before the building operations 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 Policies DM1, DM3 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

C4 Immediately following the implementation of this permission, notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any other revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) no development within the following Classes of Schedule 2 of the Order shall take place.

Part 1

Class A - enlargement, improvement or other alteration to the dwelling
Class B - enlargement consisting of an addition to the roof
Class C - alteration to the roof
Class E - provision of any building or enclosure
Class F - any hard surface

Part 2

Class B – the formation, laying out and construction of a means of access to a highway

No development of any of the above classes shall be constructed or placed on any part of the land subject of this permission.

Reason: To ensure adequate planning control over further development having regard to the limitations of the site in the Green Belt and Moor Park Conservation Area and to safeguard the residential amenity of and neighbouring properties and in the interests of the visual amenities of the site and the area in general, in accordance with Policies CP1, CP11 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policies DM1, DM2, DM3 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the Moor Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2006).

- C5 Before the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the windows in the first floor flank elevations facing 5 and 9 Askew Road shall be fitted with purpose made obscured glazing and shall be top level opening only at 1.7m above the floor level of the rooms in which the window is installed. The windows shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

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

- C6 No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected between 7 and 9 Askew Road. The boundary treatment shall be erected prior to occupation and carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of neighbouring properties and the character of the locality in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM3 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

- C7 No trees, hedgerows or shrubs within the curtilage of the site, except those shown on the approved plan(s) or otherwise clearly indicated in the approved details as being removed, shall be felled, lopped or pruned, nor shall any roots be removed or pruned without the prior consent of the Local Planning Authority during development and for a period of five years after completion of the development hereby approved. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with BS: 3998 (2010) 'Recommendations for tree works'. Any trees, hedgerows or shrubs removed or which die or become

dangerous, damaged or diseased before the end of a period of five years after completion of the development hereby approved shall be replaced with new trees, hedging or shrub species (of such size species and in such number and position as maybe agreed in writing), before the end of the first available planting season (1st October to 31st March) following their loss or removal.

Reason: The existing trees/hedgerows/shrubs represent an important public visual amenity in the area and should be protected in accordance with the requirements of Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

- C8 No operations (including tree felling, pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction, or any other operation involving the use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) shall commence on site in connection with the development hereby approved until the branch structure and trunks of all trees shown to be retained and all other trees not indicated as to be removed and their root systems have been protected from any damage during site works, in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The protective measures, including fencing, shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed within any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. No fires shall be lit or liquids disposed of within 10.0m of an area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the approved scheme.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the trees, area and to meet the requirements of Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

- C9 No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, which shall include the location of all existing trees and hedgerows affected by the proposed development, and details of those to be retained, together with a scheme detailing measures for their protection in the course of development.

All hard landscaping works required by the approved scheme shall be carried out and completed prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted. All soft landscaping works required by the approved scheme shall be carried out in accordance with a programme to be agreed before development commences and shall be maintained including the replacement of any trees or plants which die are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased in the next planting season with others of a similar size or species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation for a period for five years from the date of the approved scheme was completed.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM3 and DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

- C10 Before the building operations hereby permitted are commenced, plans and details of the proposed air source heat pump as detailed in the submitted C PLAN Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the air source heat pump has been implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity and to meet the requirements of Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM4, DM9 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

- C11 The development shall not be occupied until the energy saving and measures detailed within the C-PLAN assessment dated September 2014 submitted as part of the application are incorporated into the approved development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development meets the requirements of Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM4 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and to ensure that the development makes as full a contribution to sustainable development as possible.

- C12 No works of site clearance, demolition or construction to begin until a Protected Species/Habitat Survey and Assessment and, if necessary, a method statement (as for a European Protected Species Licence) for bats has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. All works to proceed in accordance with the approved scheme of mitigation. The development shall only proceed in accordance with the approved Method Statement.

Reason: To ensure that any protected species are safeguarded and to meet the requirements of Policies CP1, CP9 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 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 application form; the relevant form is available on the Council's website (www.threerivers.gov.uk). 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. The Council's Building Control section can be contacted on telephone number 01923 727132 or at the website above for more information and application forms.

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.

12 The applicant is reminded that the Control of Pollution Act 1974 stipulates that construction activity (where work is audible at the site boundary) should be restricted to 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

13 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: 0845 6014523

Herts & Middlesex Bat Group: www.hmbg.org.uk

(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. A list of bat consultants can be obtained from Hertfordshire Ecology on 01992 555220).

14 Due to the presence of National Grid apparatus in proximity to the application site, the Applicant should contact National Grid before any works are carried out to ensure National Grid apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works. Further 'Essential Guidance' can be found on the National Grid website at www.nationalgrid.com or by contacting National Grid on 0800688588.

15 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) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012. The applicant and the Local Planning Authority engaged in pre application discussions which result in a form of development that maintains/improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.

PC112/14 14/2363/FUL – Two storey and first floor front extensions, first floor side extension, first floor rear conservatory and balcony to rear, loft conversion including increase in ridge height, creation of crown roof and front and rear dormers and alterations to fenestration at GODAVARI, CHORLEYWOOD ROAD, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTS, WD3 4EP

The Planning Officer reported that at Paragraph 3.6 the first bullet point should read 'reduction in width' not depth.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved, seconded by Councillor Reena Ranger, that the application be deferred for a site visit.

On being put the Committee the motion to defer the application for a site visit was CARRIED the voting being 3 For, 1 Against and 5 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED for a site visit.

PC113/14 14/2364/FUL – Two storey rear extension, two storey side and rear extension to create annexe, alterations to fenestration and additional openings to existing property and alterations to landscaping at 47 GROVE FARM PARK, NORTHWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE, HA6 2BQ for Mr and Mrs Ansari

The Planning Officer reported a correction at Paragraph 3.3 on page 70, the second from last sentence stated that the annexe would be set 1.2 metre from the shared boundary. This should read 1.1 metres.

Councillor Phil Brading said following the site visit he had come to a clear view on the application.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35 (B), Mrs Hind spoke against the application and Dr Nabeel spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Ann Shaw said she had listened to both speakers comments. She would not be moving refusal of the application but suggested that the applicant be asked to reconsider the access arrangements. The access would cause disruption, nuisance and invasion of privacy on No.48. The tree currently there would also have to be removed. If the access was used all the time it would be un-neighbourly. Could the applicant move the access to inside the main house. There would be an invasion of privacy on No.48 sitting room.

Councillor Peter Getkahn proposed that the application be refused as the proposed development would be un-neighbourly and would impact on the amenity area of the neighbour, seconded by Councillor Phil Brading. There should be consideration for a complete redesign. The bulk was unnecessary in the area but he was sympathetic to the applicant's circumstances.

Councillor Phil Brading said he was also sympathetic to the applicant's situation but the impact on the neighbour would be unsatisfactory with the proximity of the annexe. The noise from people coming and going to the annexe would be un-neighbourly, its proximity to the boundary, the overbearing nature and parking. There was already an existing shortfall of one parking space along with the lack of a usable garage. There were different traffic and parking requirements in this cul-de-sac location. The existing family may not make a difference to the parking once the building was built but the Council could not control this.

The Chairman of the Committee advised that parking arrangements were inadequate.

The Planning Officer advised that the highways authority had not raised any objection. On parking standards the Local Plan stated there should be three parking places but currently there was a shortfall of one parking space against Council standards.

Councillor Debbie Morris said the applicant wanted an individual self contained unit with its own individual front door. There could be an additional two bedroom property which would add to the shortfall of parking.

The Chairman of the Committee advised that the proposal was for an annexe not for an individual unit.

Councillor Debbie Morris made comment to a recent appeal decision in Solesbridge Close which had a similar parking situation and was within a cul-de-sac location. This location also had a shortfall in parking and this was a material consideration at the appeal. She wished to include in the reason for refusal the impact and harm on the character of the area.

Councillor Peter Getkahn was happy to add impact on the character of the area but stated again he had sympathy with the applicant and the Committee should not rule out another application coming forward in the future.

Councillor Phil Brading was not happy to include the impact on the character of the area in the reason for refusal.

The Planning Officer advised that the points which Officers understood were the grounds proposed for refusal of the application were:

Impact on the amenity of No.48
Insufficient parking

The final wording of the reason for refusal to be agreed by Members following the meeting.

On being put to the Committee the motion that planning permission be refused on the grounds of the impact on amenity of No.48 and insufficient parking was CARRIED the voting being 8 For, 1 Against and 0 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the following reasons: (the final wording having been agreed by Members following the Committee meeting):-

- R1 The proposed development by reason of the siting, scale, design, use and proximity to the boundary of the two storey side and rear extension and access to create an annexe would result in an overbearing, overdominant and un-neighbourly form of development to the neighbour at 48 Grove Farm Park to the detriment of the residential amenities of the occupiers of this dwelling. The development would therefore 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 LDD (adopted July 2013).
- R2 In the absence of adequate on-site parking provision in accordance with standards, the proposed development would be likely to result in an increase in vehicles being parked outside the site on the public highway within the turning head of a cul-de-sac and the surrounding area to the detriment of highway safety and the free flow of traffic, to the character and appearance of the area and to the amenity of local residents. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies CP1, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1,

Informative:

- I1 In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012, the Local Planning Authority has considered the application in a positive and proactive manner, however, 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.

PC114/14 14/2467/RSP – Retrospective: Alterations to rear external fire exit at ABBEYFIELD UK, GREVILLE HOUSE, CHORLEYWOOD CLOSE, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTS, WD3 4EG for Mr Moody

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35 (B), Mr Oliver spoke against the application and Mr Kirby spoke in support of the application.

Local Ward Councillor Paula Hiscocks said the site was within the Conservation Area and the fire exit was clearly visible from Nightingale Road, the local public cemetery and other local gardens. The current materials used did not mitigate its visual impact on the Conservation Area and the blue staircase was not suitable in this location.

The Chairman of the Committee said the original planning permission (14/0762/FUL) had been approved for the construction of the staircase with glazing and solid balustrades and vertical timber panelling. It was noted that a fire officer report had requested a change to the type of panelling to be used.

The Planning Officer reported that the applicant had submitted the Fire Officer advice they had received advising not to use the extent of the timber proposed. Officers had not been aware of the advice and there was no consultation with the Fire Officer on the previous application.

The Chairman of the Committee said the appearance of the staircase was detrimental to the area and could be seen from the neighbouring gardens and was not what permission was granted for. Alders were not substantial trees which could hide the staircase. He asked if the application was refused could the blue panels be painted over to make them less obtrusive. The current blue colour had a negative impact on the area.

The Planning officer reported that if the Committee were minded to refuse the application the applicant could be invited to change the staircase but this would require a new application. The decision could be appealed by the applicant. Enforcement action would need to be taken with regard to the original application and the staircase. Officers advised that the applicant had not been willing to change the staircase following officer discussion.

Councillor Phil Brading said the applicant had declined to take into account the conditions on the original application. It would be expedient to take enforcement action. The colour of the staircase was very prominent in the Conservation Area. He could not see why the Committee could not refuse the application and for the Council to be prepared to take enforcement action. He proposed refusal of the retrospective application as the fire escape (specific reference to the

colour) would be harmful to the Conservation Area.

Councillor Peter Getkahn seconded the motion to refuse the application as not making this decision would make a mockery of the planning process.

Councillor Debbie Morris could see no good reason why the applicant had gone against the previous planning permission.

On being put to the Committee the motion that retrospective planning permission be refused on the grounds that the fire escape (with reference to its colour) would be harmful on the conservation area was CARRIED the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING PERMISISON BE REFUSED for the following reason: (the final wording having been agreed by Members following the Committee meeting):.

- R1 The alterations to the rear external fire escape, with specific reference to the colour, is detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality and the Upper Nightingale Conservation Area, contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

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) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012. Whilst the applicant and the Local Planning Authority engaged in discussions during the course of the application, no amendments were submitted by the applicant. 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.

PC115/14 14/2478/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two detached dwellings with integral garages and accommodation within the roof space and associated works including alterations to land levels and vehicular access at 2 THE CLIMB, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 4DX for Mr and Mrs Sheldon

Application withdrawn.

PC116/14 14/2483/RSP – Retrospective: Application of render to rear elevation of rear extension and replacement of windows with sash windows at 3 NEW ROAD, CROXLEY GREEN, HERTS, WD3 3EJ for Kate McHale

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35 (B), Kate McHale spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Phil Brading spoke to the Committee with regard to the points from the Parish Council. The dwelling had significant prominence leading into the area but had received little improvement over the years but was worthy of improved presentation of the key features in relation to the houses at No.1 and

No5 on either side. Casement windows were traditional to these types of dwellings in this Conservation Area. Sash windows had been installed and the Committee were able to view photographs of the windows which were much thicker with regard to their frames. The main complaint from the neighbour was they were out of character and were incorrect. The finish to the rear elevation of the rear extension could not be seen from the front but would cover a very large area. Permission was being sought for the rear elevation to be rendered and not kept as red brick which would affect the character of the terrace and was one of the main issues of the residents and Parish Council.

The Planning Officer reported that the Parish Council had not objected to the original application (14/0126/FUL) subject to conservation regulations. A neighbour had made comments which had resulted in the Parish Council calling in the application to the District Planning Committee.

The Planning Officer advised that the rendering was to be painted grey which would be more appropriate.

Councillor David Major thanked officers for the clarification regarding the rendering. He moved the recommendation that part retrospective planning permission be granted to have effect from the date on which the development was carried out and is subject to conditions, seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya.

On being put to the Committee the motion that part retrospective planning permission be granted to have effect from the date on which the development was carried out and is subject to conditions was CARRIED the voting being 7 For, 1 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That Part Retrospective PLANNING PERMISISON BE GRANTED and has effect from the date on which the development was carried out and is subject to the following conditions:

- C1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

TRDC 01, TRDC 02, TRDC 03, TRDC 04, TRDC 06, TRDC 07

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning and in the interests of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area, locality and residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policies CP1, CP9 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM3, DM6 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

- C2 Within TWO MONTHS of the date of this decision, the rear elevation of the rear extension shall be finished in a Sandtex Smooth Masonry Paint 'Plymouth Grey' colour as per the submitted details on plan reference TRDC 07, and permanently maintained as such. Any variation from the agreed colour shall be first submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing 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, CP9 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM1, DM3 and Appendix 2 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 application form; the relevant form is available on the Council's website (www.threerivers.gov.uk). 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. The Council's Building Control section can be contacted on telephone number 01923 727132 or at the website above for more information and application forms.

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 Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans this decision notice solely grants retrospective consent for the application of render to the rear elevation of the rear extension and the replacement of windows with sash windows. All other works should be in accordance with planning permission 14/0126/FUL.
- I3 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.
- I4 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) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012.

PC117/14 14/2493/FUL – Demolition of outbuildings and construction of 14 houses, shared sports facilities and wildlife hide with associated contamination remediation, access and landscaping works at VALLEY VIEW FARM, OXHEY LANE, CARPENDERS PARK, HERTFORDSHIRE, HA5 4AJ for Amba Developments Limited

The Planning Officer reported that there was an error at paragraph 7.5.2 of the report on page 141. The final sentence should read 'However it is noted that the habitable windows affected would be secondary glazing to habitable rooms which would also be served by additional glazing to other elevations.'

14 further public comments had been received in support of the proposal on grounds as set out at section 4 of the report and commenting that 89% of the site would remain as open space.

A 65 signature petition and 14 further public comments have been received objecting to the proposal on grounds as set out at Section 4 of the report.

Comments had also been received from CPRE Hertfordshire objecting to the development on grounds that it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would be harmful by reason of the design, scale and use of the development and would result in loss of openness, urbanisation and encroachment into the countryside. In relation to the suggested very special circumstances, CPRE Hertfordshire do not consider that these are very special circumstances that would outweigh the harm and comment that the countryside does not consist of, nor can it be reinforced by additional trees and hedges and Planning Inspectors have held that additional tree and hedgerow planting can be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. Concern was also raised that there was no indication of the impact on infrastructure, there will be high car dependency and traffic will be increased on already busy roads.

Officers had received today from the agent a letter and further plans including an area comparison; house size comparison, proposed site plan; section and plan illustrating potential for additional parking for the sports centre. There had not been time for officers to review this further information. The website would be updated in due course and the officer's committee report updated accordingly before the March Committee meeting.

Councillor Chris Whately-Smith proposed that the application be deferred for a site visit but this was not supported by the other Committee members.

Parish Councillor Pam Hames said this site was within the Green Belt and was on Green Belt land and the footpath was well used and must be protected. She asked the Committee to consider refusing the application.

Local Ward Councillor Angela Roberts said the proposed application would cause detrimental harm if allowed to go ahead. The hazardous toxic waste should be removed by the andowner anyway. The service road would be via the already very busy Oxhey Lane. Access to services would be difficult as the site was remote. The site was on Green Belt land within Carpenders Park.

Councillor Ann Shaw said the proposed application was wholly inappropriate in the Green Belt and agreed that a recommendation to approve could open up for more applications. What was being proposed here was 14 houses but without suitable gardens. It would not be appropriate and she asked why the contaminated waste had not been dealt with before.

RESOLVED:

There was no recommendation for approval or refusal at this stage in the consideration of the application. Consequently, the Committee noted the report, and made the general comments detailed above with regard to the material planning considerations raised by the application with specific attention paid to the following issues:

- Impact on Green Belt and the very special circumstances put forward to outweigh harm to the Green Belt.
- Impact on character and the visual amenities of the area.
- The proposed affordable housing provision.
- Parking provision to serve the development.

PC118/14 14/2495/FUL – Demolition of no. 18 Gallows Hill Lane and construction of four detached dwellings on land to the rear with associated access, landscaping, parking and alterations to existing access at 18 GALLOWS HILL LANE, ABBOTS LANGLEY, WD5 0DA for Thorne Barton Estates Ltd

Councillor David Major left the meeting during the consideration of this application.

The Planning Officer reported that the applicant had provided additional detail relating to the sustainability measures and CPlan Energy Statement. The actual saving achieved from Low or Zero Carbon Technologies and Energy Efficiency Measures over the TER Building is 10% combined saving over the TER. Reason for refusal R2 on page 167 is therefore recommended to be removed.

The Landscape Officer had provided comments. He considered that the major arboricultural impact of the proposal was the removal of two semi-mature Sycamore trees protected by a TPO to facilitate the proposed access to the site. The submitted Landscape Proposals Plan proposed to replace these trees with two semi-mature English Oak trees further into the site. The Landscape Officer considers that, due to the submitted plan being a Proposals Plan rather than a Landscaping Scheme, the proposed replanting does not adequately mitigate the proposed loss of trees. However, it is considered that a condition requiring the submission of a full landscaping scheme would be sufficient to mitigate the loss of the trees.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35 (B), Mr Johnson spoke against the application and Mr Tyms spoke in support of the application.

Local Ward Councillor Keith Williams asked if the 10% over the TER would be sufficient and whether Reason R2 for refusal could be removed? The Planning Officer advised that Policy DM4 preceded previous policy and the 10% was above the 2014 buildings regulations.

The Chairman of the Committee, seconded by Councillor Ann Shaw, moved the recommendation that planning permission be refused.

On being put to the Committee the motion to refuse planning permission was CARRIED the voting being 7 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the following reason:-

R1 The proposed backland scheme, by reason of the cramped layout and contrived layout, garden depths and plot sizes would result in a form of development which would be unable to maintain the prevalent character of the area to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality. As such, the proposal 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 LDD.

Informative:

I1 In line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012, the Local Planning Authority has considered, in a positive and proactive manner, whether the planning objections to this proposal could be

satisfactorily resolved within the statutory period for determining the application. Whilst the applicant and the Local Planning Authority engaged in pre-application discussions, 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.

PC119/14 14/2520/FUL – Demolition of the existing hotel and restaurant and the construction of 33 apartments and 4 houses with associated access, car parking spaces, cycle storage, amenity space and landscaping works, at THE LONG ISLAND EXCHANGE, 2 VICTORIA CLOSE, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 4EQ for Chase (Rickmansworth) Ltd Formerly Key Homes

The Planning officer reported that amended plans had been received this week. These relate solely to the 4 dwelling houses (Block C). The ground floors were shown to have an 'L' shaped footprint, however, on the amended plans this has been in-filled to create a straight rear building line to both pairs of semi-detached dwellings. No change is proposed at first floor level. The website will be updated and the report updated before the March committee meeting.

11 further letters of objection have been received. These largely reiterate those objections which are set out on page 182 of the committee report. The further comments that are made are:

- Would adversely affect adjacent conservation areas due to scale and bulk.
- The previous scheme included the retention of the façade and was welcomed.
- Objections to loss of hotel.

Comments from Hertfordshire Highways (summary):

- Do not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to conditions regarding parking and manoeuvring and construction management.
- The development would attract a sustainable transport planning obligation contribution of £35,500.

Hertfordshire Property Services – have submitted comments which advise of the financial contributions they would wish to secure through a S106 Agreement towards education, libraries etc.

Comments from HCC Archaeology - This office recommended that archaeological conditions were attached to planning permission 14/0945/FUL and that a programme of historic building recording was undertaken prior to any development. This has been satisfactorily completed, therefore they will be making no further comment at this time.

Councillor Ann Shaw said there had been a gap after the last application and before that a series of applications for the development of the site. The last application had seen the retention of the exiting façade of the hotel and there had been detailed discussions by the Committee on the applications on this site. Had the Community Infrastructure Levy been taken into consideration? She had concerns regarding the screening, the landscaping scheme, the loss of the historical architectural features, the open space management plan, the shortage of 16 parking places. The situation had now taken a step backwards and the applicant should proceed with the original permission. She was not in favour of this new proposal.

Local Ward Councillor Paula Hiscocks was disappointed that this application proposed to demolish the original building. Policy CP3 stated that developments should cater for a range of housing needs which should include three bedroom family units. Four large 5 bedroom houses were not suitable to meet family needs. The application proposed a shortfall of 16 parking spaces. She also asked if checks had been made regarding parking in garages. Parking in the Rickmansworth town was already limited.

The Planning Officer reported that this report was an issues report at this stage and the next report would be updated for the next meeting.

Councillor Peter Getkahn said there were too many developments with insufficient family homes for the area.

RESOLVED:

Members noted there was no recommendation for approval or refusal at this stage in the consideration of the application as there were outstanding issues, for example, viability and affordable housing.

The Committee noted the report, and made some general comments with regard to the material planning issues raised by the application in the minute above.

PC120/14 15/0130/FUL – District Council Application: Installation of play area within existing public play and open space at HORNHILL RECREATION GROUND, CHALFONT ROAD, MAPLE CROSS for Three Rivers District Council

The Planning Officer reported that Officers were recommending that this application be deferred until the March committee meeting. Following receipt of comments from the Landscape Officer who had raised concerns regarding the proximity of certain play equipment to trees within the site, discussions had taken place and an amended layout plan was to be submitted. Neighbours would be re-consulted and the revised application would be brought to Committee in March.

RESOLVED

That the application be DEFERRED to the March meeting.

PC121/14 15/0132/FUL – District Council Application: Installation of play area within existing public play and open space at PLAY AREA, GREENFIELD AVENUE, CARPENDERS PARK for Three Rivers District Council

The Planning Officer reported that Condition 2 on Page 207 should be updated to include and in accordance with Design and Access Statement.

Councillor Phil Brading, seconded by Councillor Peter Getkahn, moved the recommendation that subject to no new material considerations being raised, planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

On being put to the Committee the motion that subject to no new material considerations being raised, planning permission be granted subject to conditions was CARRIED the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That subject to no new material considerations being raised, 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: APM/ C570 /001 Revision B and Design and Access Statement Revision A.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the proper interests of planning in accordance with Policies PSP2, CP1, CP9, CP10 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policies DM6, DM11, DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

- C3 The development shall not be completed other than in the materials as have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as stated in part 9 of the application form, and no external materials shall be used other than those approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011).

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 application form; the relevant form is available on the Council's website (www.threerivers.gov.uk). 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. The Council's Building Control section can be contacted on telephone number 01923 727132 or at the website above for more information and application forms.

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.

- I3 The applicant is advised that separate advertisement consent may be required for any signage associated with the play area.
- I4 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) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012.

CHAIRMAN