

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 21 JANUARY 2021

PART I - DELEGATED

- 5. 20/2352/FUL - Erection of single storey front extension, first floor side and rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable use, alterations to landscape features include removal and replanting of tree, enlargement of front driveway and rear patio at 38 ARNETT WAY, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 4DA.**
(DCES)

Parish: Non-parished

Ward: Penn and Mill End

Expiry of Statutory Period: 31 December 2020

Case Officer: Katy Brackenboro

Extension agreed to 22 January 2021

Recommendation: That Planning Permission be Granted.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: Called in by three Members of the Planning Committee unless Officers are minded to refuse, due to the bulk, prominence and colour of rendering.

1 Relevant Planning History

- 1.1 20/0953/FUL - Erection of single-storey front extension, first-floor side and rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable use, alterations to landscape features including removal and replanting of trees, enlargement of front driveway and rear patio. Refused. 21.07.2020.

Reason for refusal:

The proposed first floor side and rear extension, by virtue of its siting to the rear relative to No. 36 Arnett Way would result in a form of development which would significantly erode the privacy levels currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 36 Arnett Way to such an extent that it would result in unacceptable levels of perceived and actual overlooking thereby undermining their residential amenity. As such the proposed first floor rear aspect would harm the amenity of the occupants of No. 36 Arnett Way and would be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2013) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

2 Description of Application Site

- 2.1 The application site is located on the southern side of the northern arm of Arnett Way, which consists of detached dwellings of a similar design and scale, though front extensions are visible within the streetscene. The properties on this side of Arnett Way have been designed in such a way that they have been built on a staggered building line and are set at an angle to the road such that the rear of the two storey element of one house aligns with the rear of the single storey element of the next.
- 2.2 The application dwelling is a two storey detached property predominately of brown brickwork although white-painted cladding provides a design feature at first floor level within the principal elevation. The host dwelling has a brown tiled roof with solar panels on the south-east facing roofslope. To the eastern side of the dwelling is an attached flat roofed garage which projects 2.6m forward of the main front elevation. The dwelling is set at a slightly lower land level to the highway and is set back from the highway by approximately 8m. The front garden consists of soft landscaping and

there are several trees to the frontage of the application site including a silver birch tree. There is a driveway with parking provision for two cars.

- 2.3 To the rear, the property has a staggered rear building line. There is a patio which abuts the rear elevation of the host dwelling and the remainder of the garden is laid to lawn. The land levels slope to the rear of the application site which is enclosed by close boarded fencing and mature trees.
- 2.4 The neighbouring detached property to the east at No.36 Arnett Way is set back in relation to the application dwelling and is located on a slightly higher land level to the host dwelling. It has not implemented any extensions and has a similar design to the host dwelling with a flat roofed garage to its flank. The shared boundary treatment consists of 1.8m high close boarded fencing.
- 2.5 The application site adjoins the rear gardens of Nos.2-6 Arnett Way to the west. The boundary treatment comprises of 1.8m high close boarded timber fencing. The rear of the application site is enclosed by 1.8m close boarded fencing. The site also backs on the rear gardens of No.8 and No.14 Arnett Way.

3 Description of Proposed Development

- 3.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of single-storey front extension, first-floor side and rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable use, alterations to landscape features including removal and replanting of tree, enlargement of front driveway and rear patio.
- 3.2 The proposed single storey front extension would project 2.7m forward of the main front elevation to align with the front building line of the garage and would have a width of 8.4m to adjoin the existing garage (to be converted, see below). It would have a mono-pitched roof form with a maximum height of 3.4m and eaves height of 2.1m. Fenestration and a front door would be inserted into the front elevation with white windows to match the existing dwelling. Two rooflights would be inserted into the front roofslope. The rooflights would be grey in colour.
- 3.3 The proposed first floor side/rear extension would be constructed above the existing single storey garage. It would have a width of 2.9m to the front, and total depth of 9.1m, extending a maximum of 3.7m beyond the rear elevation aligning with the depth of the existing rear projection of the host dwelling. It would be set off the common boundary with No.36 by 1.2m. The western part of the two storey rear element would extend beyond the rear elevation of the existing first floor by 2.7m to create a staggered rear building line at first floor level. The rear aspect would have a width of 2.2m at its deepest point and would be set in 1.2m from the common boundary with No.36 Arnett Way and set in 7.4m from the common boundary with Nos.2-6 Arnett Way. It would have a gabled roof with a ridge height of 6.3m and eaves height to match the host dwelling. Fenestration would be inserted into the front, flank and recessed part of the rear elevation at first floor. Rooflights would be inserted into the flank roof slopes of the first floor rear extension.
- 3.4 The side/rear extension would be faced in white painted render at first floor level and bricks at ground floor level to match external materials of the existing dwelling and existing solar panels would be relocated into the rear roofslope of the existing house.
- 3.5 The proposal includes the conversion of the existing garage into habitable accommodation in the form of a store and utility/WC. The existing garage doors would be replaced with white framed doors. High level fenestration would be inserted into

the north eastern flank elevation of the existing dwelling at ground floor level. An obscure glazed window would be inserted at first floor level in the existing dwelling.

- 3.6 The proposal includes alterations to the front of the application site. The silver birch tree to the frontage of the application site is shown to be retained and a second tree (T2) removed. Additional hardstanding is proposed to the front of the application site to provide parking provision for an additional car. The driveway would be widened to 8.4m at its maximum width with soft landscaping retained to the western side of the front amenity space.
- 3.7 The proposal includes an extension of the existing rear patio. It would be increased in depth by approximately 1.9m with an overall width of 12m and height not exceeding 0.3m.
- 3.8 This application has been submitted further to the refusal of planning application 20/0953/FUL. The changes between the previously refused scheme 20/0953/FUL and the current application are as follows:
- The depth of the first floor side/rear extension has been increased from 8.6m to 9.1m. It would now project 3.7m beyond the existing two storey rear elevation, whereas in the previous application it projected 3.1m beyond this elevation.
 - The rear element of the first floor side/rear extension now has an L-shaped plan form, with only one rear-facing window set on the recessed wall and set away from the boundary with No.36, whereas the previous application had one flush rear wall with two rear-facing windows.
 - The current application includes the retention of the Silver Birch tree in the front garden, whereas this was proposed to be removed as part of the previous application. The shape of the driveway has been revised to accommodate this.

4 Consultation

4.1 Statutory Consultation

4.1.1 Landscape Officer: [No objection]

It is noted that previous assessments of the site concluded that the birch tree to the frontage of the site, whilst in reasonable condition does not warrant protection by TPO. However, the plans indicate that the applicant intends to retain the tree and project it during development. A condition could be applied to ensure compliance with the submitted tree protection plan. Also, a compliance condition could be applied requiring that no trees are cut down to facilitate the development, and if any are, a replacement planting will be required.

4.1.2 National Grid: No response received

4.2 Public/Neighbour Consultation

4.2.1 Number consulted: 9

4.2.2 No of responses received: Objections have been received from three neighbouring properties.

4.2.3 Summary of responses:

- The existing ground floor extension is not exactly in line with the ground floor of No.36.
- The gap between the application dwelling and the proposal is not 1.2m.
- First floor rear element would have a roof which would be excessively prominent and out of place and scale with the existing dwelling and surrounding properties along Arnett Way. It result as a dominant feature in the middle of Arnett Way.
- Render would appear alien to existing dwelling and have adverse impact on neighbouring properties.
- Overall height of first floor rear aspect and gabled roof unsightly from rear gardens and block view of the sky and result in loss of light.
- Need for privacy glass within the garage conversion.
- Loss of light in regard to the front extension.

4.2.4 Site Notice: Not required.

4.2.5 Press notice: Not required.

5 Reason for Delay

5.1 Committee Cycle.

6 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

In 2019 the new National Planning Policy Framework was published. This is read alongside the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The determination of planning applications is made mindful of Central Government advice and the Local Plan for the area. It is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and that the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against another. The NPPF is clear that “existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework”.

The NPPF states that ‘good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities’. The NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would ‘significantly and demonstrably’ outweigh the benefits.

6.2 The Three Rivers Local Development Plan

The application has been considered against the policies of the Local Plan, including the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) and the Site Allocations Local Development Document (adopted November 2014) as well as government guidance. The policies of Three Rivers District Council reflect the content of the NPPF.

The Core Strategy was adopted on 17 October 2011 having been through a full public participation process and Examination in Public. Relevant policies include Policies CP1, CP9, CP10 and CP12.

The Development Management Policies Local Development Document (DMLDD) was adopted on 26 July 2013 after the Inspector concluded that it was sound following Examination in Public which took place in March 2013. Relevant policies include DM1, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

6.3 Other

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (adopted February 2015).

The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011. The growth and Infrastructure Act achieved Royal Assent on 25 April 2013.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Habitat Regulations 1994 may also be relevant.

7 **Planning Analysis**

7.1 Background

7.1.1 This application has been submitted following the refusal of planning application 20/0953/FUL. That application was refused on the grounds that the proposed first floor side and rear extension, by virtue of its siting relative to No.36, would result in a form of development which would erode the privacy of the occupants of No.36 and would result in unacceptable levels of perceived and actual overlooking.

7.1.2 The changes between the previously refused application and the current application are set out at paragraph 3.8 above. The primary consideration for the current application is whether the changes made since the previous application was determined are sufficient to overcome the previous reason for refusal, and whether the changes introduce any other policy conflicts. This will be assessed in the analysis below.

7.2 Impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene

7.2.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy seeks to promote buildings of a high enduring design quality that respect local distinctiveness and Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy relates to design and states that in seeking a high standard of design, the Council will expect development proposals to 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area'.

7.2.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area. Extensions should not be excessively prominent and should respect the existing character of the dwelling, particularly with regard to the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors, and materials. In relation to single storey front extensions, Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document outlines that applications will be assessed on their individual merits but should not result in loss of light to windows of a neighbouring property nor be excessively prominent in the street scene.

7.2.3 The proposed single storey front extension would have a depth of 2.7m and it would extend across the front elevation of the dwelling. There is some existing variation within the streetscene of Arnett Way in terms of front extensions and given the depth, height and design of the proposed front extension, it is not considered that these

elements would result in any harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling, streetscene or wider area. No objections were raised by officers in their consideration of the previous application in respect of the single storey front extension and this element remains unchanged.

- 7.2.4 Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD advises that in order to prevent a terracing effect and maintain an appropriate spacing between dwellings in character with the locality, first floor extensions should be a minimum of 1.2m from the flank boundary. The proposed first floor extension would be located approximately 1.2m from the flank boundary with No.36, therefore in accordance with Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document. This is considered to retain appropriate spacing between dwellings and would respect the characteristics of the area.
- 7.2.5 Concern has been raised by neighbours that the extensions proposed constitute a large development within a street of staggered detached houses. However, other dwellings within the vicinity have been extended at first floor level to the side and as such, this type of extension would not be uncharacteristic. Furthermore, as noted above the side extension is considered acceptable on its own merits.
- 7.2.6 Further concern has been raised by neighbours that the first floor side/rear extension would result in an overly prominent feature within Arnett Way. The proposed first floor rear extension would be visible from the front of the dwelling but given it would be set in from both neighbouring boundaries, its scale and gabled roof form it is not considered that it would result in any adverse impact to the visual appearance of Arnett Way.
- 7.2.7 Concerns were also raised regarding the proposed materiality of the proposed first floor side and rear extension. Render is proposed to this element, however given that it would not be readily visible from the streetscene, it is not considered that the use of render is inappropriate in this instance, taking in consideration that the existing dwelling is finished predominately of brown brickwork with white painted cladding at first floor level within the principal elevation
- 7.2.8 The garage conversion would involve the replacement of the garage doors with a window which would be flush with the existing wall of the dwelling. The fenestration would match the style of the existing fenestration and consequently, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any adverse impact to the visual appearance of Arnett Way.
- 7.2.9 The rooflights would be flush against the roofslope and are not considered excessive in scale. As such they would not appear unduly prominent within the streetscene
- 7.2.10 The proposal would include alterations to the application site frontage. The alterations would include extending the existing hardstanding to the western aspect of the frontage where there is currently an area of lawn, a silver birch (shown to be retained) and other soft landscaping. It is acknowledged that the proposed alterations to the frontage could be completed under Permitted Development. Many of the dwellings within the vicinity have large areas of block paving to the front and therefore this would not be uncharacteristic of the area.
- 7.2.11 The extended patio would be sited to the rear of the dwelling and would therefore not result in any adverse harm to the visual amenity within the street scene. The patio would be of an acceptable scale such that it would not dominate the rear garden.

7.2.12 In summary, whilst the proposal would increase the scale of the dwelling, given the scale and design of the proposed extensions and the existing variation within the streetscene of Arnett Way, it is not considered that the proposal would result in harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling, streetscene or wider area. No objections were raised by Officers as part of the previous planning application in respect of this consideration, and the current application is also considered to comply with Policies CP1 and CP12 of Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD (adopted July 2013).

7.3 Impact on amenity of neighbours

7.3.1 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 extensions 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.

7.3.2 To ensure that loss of light would not occur to the habitable rooms of neighbouring dwellings as a result of new development, the Design Criteria at Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document advise that two storey rear development should not intrude a 45 degree spay line across the rear garden from a point on the joint boundary, level with the rear wall of the adjacent property. This principle is dependent on the spacing and relative positions of properties and consideration will be given to the juxtaposition of properties, land levels and the position of windows and development on neighbouring properties.

7.3.3 As previously noted, no objections were raised in the previous application by officers in respect of the impact of the single storey front extension on the amenities of neighbours. This element remains unchanged such that the same conclusion is reached here. The proposed single storey front extension would be constructed in line with the existing western flank of the host dwelling. Given the single storey scale of the proposed front extension and the spacing retained between the proposed extension and the western flank boundary, it is not considered that this element would appear overbearing or result in loss of light to the neighbours to the west. It would be screened from the neighbours to the east by the existing garage and so would have no adverse impact on occupants of this neighbouring property.

7.3.4 As previously noted, no objections were raised in the previous application by officers in respect of the impact of the garage conversion and new windows on the amenities of neighbours. This element remains unchanged such that the same conclusion is reached here. The garage would be converted as part of this application. Flank windows are proposed within the eastern flank at ground floor level with the existing dwelling. It is noted that an objection was raised by a neighbouring property regarding a loss of privacy. However the proposed flank windows, to be inserted within the existing dwelling, would be high level windows which would not enable any overlooking such that a loss of privacy would result. It is also not considered reasonable or necessary that these proposed windows be obscurely glazed.

7.3.5 The proposed first floor side/rear extension would be constructed over the existing garage and would be set in from the common boundary with No.36 by approximately 1.2m. The existing dwelling is set forward of this adjacent neighbour and the proposed extension would not project beyond the rear of the rear elevation of No.36. As a result of its siting, it is not considered that the extension would be unduly overbearing or result in a loss of light.

- 7.3.6 Objections have been received in relation to the appearance of the first floor rear extension from neighbours to the west. It is considered that the proposed first floor extension would have a limited impact on the neighbouring dwellings to the west at No.4 and 6 as there would be no intrusion of the 45 degree line and the rear aspect of the first floor extension would be set in from the common boundary by 7.4m. Furthermore, the rear elevations of these properties would be located some 20m away from the proposal. As such, whilst the extension would be visible from these neighbouring properties, it is not considered given the scale and siting of the proposed gable roof that the extension would result in any loss of light or have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring dwellings at Nos.4 and 6 Arnett Way.
- 7.3.7 Objections have been received in relation to the impact of the first floor rear extension from the adjacent neighbour to the east. This neighbour has raised concern that the extension would result in a loss of light to the rear garden and kitchen and would also result in a loss of privacy compared to the existing situation. The properties on this side of Arnett Way have a staggered building line where the rear of the two storey element of one house aligns with the rear of the single storey element of the next. Consequently, No.34 is set further back in its plot in relation to No.36 where the two houses are close to each other, and No.36 is set further back than the application dwelling's rear elevation where the two are in close proximity to each other. It is noted that the neighbouring property at No.36 follows a similar building pattern and has no rear extension. It is noted that a 45 degree line from a point of the common boundary level with the rear elevation of No.36 does not result in any intrusion. The proposed first floor rear projection would not project beyond the rear of No.36 and having regard to its siting and size, it is not considered that this element would appear overbearing or visually intrusive when viewed from No.36.
- 7.3.8 In refusing the previous planning application, it was determined that the first floor side and rear element, by virtue of its siting and the location of the rear facing windows, would erode the privacy levels enjoyed by No.36 Arnett Way. In the current application, in terms of overlooking, the number of rear facing windows has been reduced from two to one. The rear facing window proposed would be sited within the recessed part of the extension and thus screened from No.36 by the deeper element of the extension. The proposed outlook of the non-recessed element of the first floor rear element would primarily overlook the rear amenity space of the application dwelling. As such, having regard to the position of the window, and the use of part of the extension to obscure any views toward No.36, it is not considered that the side/rear extension would give rise to any unacceptable overlooking to No.36. As such, it is considered that this proposal overcomes the previous reason for refusal.
- 7.3.9 Glazing is also proposed within the front elevation at first floor level however this would not facilitate unacceptable levels of overlooking to any neighbouring properties as it would overlook the front amenity space of the host dwelling. The proposed window within the eastern flank at first floor would serve a bathroom. It is considered reasonable to attach a condition to any grant of planning permission to ensure that this first floor level window is 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. In order to ensure that the privacy of No.36 is protected, a condition could be added preventing the installation of any additional flank windows. There would be no impact to those neighbours opposite the site as the separation by the public highway would mitigate any impact.
- 7.3.10 There is no fenestration proposed at first floor level within the western flank and as such no overlooking would be facilitated to Nos.4 -6 Arnett Way.

- 7.3.11 The proposed rooflights would be set flush against the roofslope and as such would not give rise to any unacceptable overlooking to any neighbouring dwellings.
- 7.3.12 The proposed rear patio would not be excessive in depth or height and would be screened by existing boundary treatments and would not result in any overlooking to any neighbouring dwelling.
- 7.3.13 As such, it is considered that the proposal would overcome the previous reason for refusal. It would not result in any adverse impact to the amenities of the occupants of any neighbouring dwelling and is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy, Policies DM1, DM3 and, Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies (adopted July 2013).

7.4 Amenity Space Provision for future occupants

- 7.4.1 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. Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD states that 'amenity space must be provided within the curtilage of all new residential developments'.
- 7.4.2 The proposed development would result in a five bedroom dwelling (the ground floor study could be used as a bedroom). Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document sets out that a five bedroom dwelling should retain 126sqm of private, usable amenity space. The application site has an amenity space of approximately 170sqm, thus it would exceed the guideline figure and would be sufficient amenity space to serve the proposed property.

7.5 Wildlife and Biodiversity

- 7.5.1 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.
- 7.5.2 Biodiversity protection and protected species are a material planning consideration during the application process of this application. This is in accordance with Policy CP9 of the Core strategy in addition to Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies Local Development Document. Local Authorities, in line with National Planning Policy, are required to ensure that a protected species survey is completed for applications whereby biodiversity may be affected prior to the determination of the application.
- 7.5.3 A biodiversity checklist was submitted with the application this stated that no protected species or biodiversity factors will be affected as a result of the application. The Local Planning Authority is not aware of any protected species within the immediate area that would require further assessment. It is noted that a bat informative would be added to any grant of approval as the proposal result in an alteration of the roof.

7.6 Trees and Landscaping

- 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 application site is not within a Conservation Area nor are there any protected trees on or near the site. However there are several trees both on the site and adjacent to the site which are considered to be of some amenity value. The Landscape Officer was consulted during the course of the application. It is noted that the application proposes the removal of one tree to the front of the application site. The Landscape Officer states raises no objection to the removal of this tree and it is considered that it is of low amenity value. It is noted that the silver birch tree to the frontage of the application site would be retained. Having reviewed the documents, the Landscape Officer considers that whilst this tree is in reasonable condition, it is not of sufficient quality to warrant protection by a TPO. The applicant has confirmed that the tree will be retained and protected during construction works and retained on site and a tree protection plan has been submitted. As such it is considered reasonable to require the development works to be implemented in accordance with the submitted tree protection plan to prevent any damage to the silver birch tree and other trees within and adjacent to the application site.
- 7.6.3 In summary, subject to conditions the proposal would comply with the requirements of DM6 of the Development Management Policies and Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011).

7.7 Highways, Access and Parking

- 7.7.1 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. The parking standards set out that for a dwelling of four bedrooms or more requires three off-street parking spaces. The proposal would create a 4 bedroom dwelling with a study at ground floor which could be classed as a bedroom.
- 7.7.2 From the site visit, it was ascertained that hardstanding to the front of the site provides two off street parking spaces and the extension would occupy some of the space currently used for parking. The proposal includes the loss of the existing garage and also includes the enlargement of the existing hardstanding to the front of the application site. This would accommodate parking for three cars. The proposal would therefore comply with the requirements of the parking standards and an area laid to lawn to the western part of the frontage and existing silver birch tree would be retained.

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: 202004-D-02-B, 202004-D-03, 202004-D-04, 202004-D-05, 202004-D-06, 202004-D-07-D, 202004-D-08-D, 202004-D-09-D, 202004-D-10-C, 202004-D-11-D and 202004-D-12.

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

- C3 The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted and approved Tree Protection Plan drawing No. 202004 –D-12.

The protective measures, including fencing and temporary ground protection, shall be undertaken in accordance with the Tree Protection Plan in accordance with drawing No. 202004-D-12 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. 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).

- C4 The alterations to external materials and fenestration shall not be implemented other than in the materials as have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as shown on drawing numbers 202004 – D- 10-C and 202004 – D- 11 –D and stated within the submitted application form and no external materials shall be used other than those approved.

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

- C5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any other revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows or similar openings [other than those expressly authorised by this permission] shall be constructed in the flank or rear 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 Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the window at first floor level within the eastern flank elevation 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 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).

- C7 Prior to first occupation of the building/extension hereby permitted, the space to the frontage of the application site shall be laid out in accordance with drawing 202004-D-07-D for three cars to be parked to the frontage of the application site and shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and convenience and to ensure appropriate levels of parking are provided in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP10 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

Informatives:

- I1 With regard to implementing this permission, the applicant is advised as follows:

All relevant planning conditions must be discharged prior to the commencement of work. Requests to discharge conditions must be made by formal application. Fees are £97 per request (or £28 where the related permission is for extending or altering a dwellinghouse or other development in the curtilage of a dwellinghouse). Please note that requests made without the appropriate fee will be returned unanswered.

There may be a requirement for the approved development to comply with the Building Regulations. Information and application forms are available at www.hertfordshirebc.co.uk. Alternatively the Council's Building Control section can be contacted on telephone number 01923 727130 or email building.control@hertfordshirebc.gov.uk.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - If your development is liable for CIL payments, it is a requirement under Regulation 67 (1) of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (As Amended) that a Commencement Notice (Form 6) is submitted to Three Rivers District Council as the Collecting Authority no later than the day before the day on which the chargeable development is to be commenced. DO NOT start your development until the Council has acknowledged receipt of the Commencement Notice. Failure to do so will mean you will lose the right to payment by instalments (where applicable), lose any exemptions already granted, and a surcharge will be imposed.

Care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to ensure no damage occurs to the verge or footpaths during construction. Vehicles delivering materials to this development shall not override or cause damage to the public footway. Any damage will require to be made good to the satisfaction of the Council and at the applicant's expense.

Where possible, energy saving and water harvesting measures should be incorporated. Information on this is also available from the Council's Building Control section. Any external changes to the building which may be subsequently required should be discussed with the Council's Development Management Section prior to the commencement of work.

- I2 The applicant is reminded that the Control of Pollution Act 1974 stipulates that construction activity (where work is audible at the site boundary) should be restricted to 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

13 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in its consideration of this planning application, in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The applicant and/or their agent 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.

14 Bats are protected under domestic and European legislation where, in summary, it is an offence to deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat, intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat in a roost or deliberately disturb a bat in a way that would impair its ability to survive, breed or rear young, hibernate or migrate, or significantly affect its local distribution or abundance; damage or destroy a bat roost; possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat; and intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost.

If bats are found all works must stop immediately and advice sought as to how to proceed from either of the following organisations:

The UK Bat Helpline: 0845 1300 228

Natural England: 0300 060 3900

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