

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 16 DECEMBER 2021

PART I - DELEGATED

5. 21/1190/FUL – Construction of a single storey front and rear extension, part two storey front, side and rear extension including Juliet balcony to principal elevation, fenestration alterations at 24 SHERFIELD AVENUE, RICKMANSWORTH, WD3 1NL

Parish: Batchworth Community Council
Expiry of Statutory Period: 30.12.2021 EOT

Ward: Rickmansworth Town
Case Officer: Katy Brackenboro

Recommendation: That Planning Permission be Granted.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: The application site is adjacent to a staff member's house.

1 Relevant Planning History

- 1.1 20/2479/FUL - Construction of a single storey rear, two storey front/side extension and raised patio to the rear. Withdrawn. 19.11.2020.
- 1.2 20/2454/FUL - Construction of single storey outbuilding. Permitted. 25.01.2021. Not implemented.
- 1.3 08/0705/CLPD - Certificate of Lawfulness Proposed Development: Conversion of garage into habitable room and a detached outbuilding at rear of the garden. Permitted. 27.05.2008. Not implemented.
- 1.4 02/01308/FUL - Two storey side and rear extensions and front porch. Refused. 25.11.2002.

2 Description of Application Site

- 2.1 The application site is irregular in shape and contains a two storey extended semi-detached dwelling located on the north-western side of Sherfield Avenue, Rickmansworth. Sherfield Avenue is a residential street characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying architectural styles and designs, many of which have been extended or altered.
- 2.2 The plot slopes down from the road to the house and continues to slope down to the end of the rear garden. The host dwelling is finished in mixed red brickwork with a dark tiled hipped roof form. To the side, there is a two storey flat roofed projection with an existing first floor front balcony. There is hardstanding to the frontage with space for at least three vehicles. The application dwelling is set back from the highway by approximately 10m.
- 2.3 To the rear of the dwelling, there is a patio area abutting the rear elevation of the host dwelling leading to a lower area of lawn which slopes down to the rear of the application site. To the rear of the application site is a shed.
- 2.4 The neighbour at number 26 Sherfield Avenue, adjoins the south-western flank of the host dwelling. This neighbour is of a similar architectural style and design to the host dwelling and has no existing extensions to the rear. It is located on a similar land level and front building line in relation to the application dwelling. It has implemented a single storey rear extension, part single, part two storey front, side and rear extension including roof extension and a front porch. There are various trees and shrubs to all boundaries, and closer to the house, is an approximate 1.6m high close boarded fence to the boundary with No.24, although the majority of this boundary is comprised of a lower weld mesh fence and vegetation.

- 2.5 The neighbour to the north-east, number 22 Sherfield Avenue, is a two storey semi-detached dwelling which is set in from the boundary and at an angle in relation to the host dwelling. It extends deeper than the application dwelling at ground floor level. It has implemented several ground floor extensions to the side and rear and the integral garage has also been converted. To the boundary with number .22 there are shrubs (approximately 1.8m high), and a fence (approximately 1.5m high). To this boundary in the front garden is a 1.6m hedge. There is one obscure glazed first floor window and one clear glazed ground floor window within the side elevation of number 22 roughly level with the front elevation of number 24.

3 Description of Proposed Development

- 3.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the construction of single storey front and rear extension, part two storey front, side and rear extension including Juliet balcony to principal elevation, fenestration alterations and rear patio.
- 3.2 The proposed development would result in the enlargement of the existing part single, part two storey front/side extension to the front (infill) and rear, the conversion of the existing garage and a single storey rear extension. The single storey infill extension to the front would extend approximately 1.7m from the existing front extension at ground floor level, and projecting 1.3m beyond the existing front bay. It would have width of 2.9m, to adjoin the converted garage. To the rear of the existing front/side extension at first floor level, the new addition would project 2.1m in depth and would have a width of 3.3m to be set in line with the non-recessed element of the existing first floor elevation of the existing house. A new pitched roof is proposed, hipped to the side, over the existing and proposed extensions to the side of the host dwelling. It would have a maximum height of 8.3m, level with the existing ridge of the host dwelling and an eaves height to match the host dwelling. The existing front projection element of the extension would have a hipped roof form. Fenestration is included within the front and rear elevations at both ground floor and first floor level, including a first floor balcony within the principal elevation. The front elevation would have a glass balustrading of some 0.8m in height and width of 2.3m to enclose the proposed balcony. A window is also proposed within the south-western flank at ground floor level to serve the utility room which is labelled as obscure glazed.
- 3.3 The garage door would be replaced with a four panelled window.
- 3.4 At ground floor level, the single storey rear extension would project 3.6m in depth, 3.6m deeper than the proposed first floor element. This element would have a width of 8.5m to span the width of the host dwelling. The single storey rear element would have a mono-pitched roof form with a maximum height of 3.9m and eaves height of 3m. Fenestration would be inserted into the rear elevation including bi-folding doors. Four steps are proposed to provide access to the rear garden. These would be set in from No. 26 by 0.2m and set in from the south-eastern flank of the proposed single storey rear extension by 3.8m. Three rooflights are proposed within the rear roofslope.
- 3.5 Submitted plans indicate that all materials for the proposed extensions would match the existing dwelling.
- 3.6 Amended plans were sought during the course of the application. The proposed ridge height of the proposed two storey front, side and rear extension was increased by 1.2m to be set in line with the existing main ridge of the host dwelling. The cladding proposed to the front extension within the principal elevation at first floor level was omitted from the scheme in favour of materials to match the existing dwelling. The proposed roof form was also altered to a hipped roof at the front. The proposed rooflights to the single storey rear extension were added to the proposed rear elevation drawings. The rendering of the exterior of the property was omitted from the scheme. Further, the erroneous red line between the extension and boundary with No. 22 on the proposed rear elevation was removed.

4 Consultation

4.1 Statutory Consultation

4.1.1 Batchworth Community Council: [No objection]

Batchworth Community Council have no objection to this application

4.1.2 Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust: No response received.

4.1.3 National Grid: No response received.

4.1.4 Herts Ecology: [Initial objection overcome]

Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Ecology on the above. We previously commented on development proposals at this address in relation to bats (20/2479/FUL on 06/01/2021 – subsequently withdrawn) and I have the following comments to make now:

I am pleased to see an ecology report has been submitted in support of this application – Ecological Appraisal, 5 March 2021 prepared by Cherryfield Ecology. The site was visited on 2 March 2021 and comprises a detached two-storey dwelling with attached garage and associated driveway and domestic gardens. The habitats were of limited ecological value; however the house had low potential for roosting bats and the trees, shrubs and hedgerows had potential for nesting birds.

Nesting birds

I understand no trees will be removed under the proposals. Notwithstanding this, if relevant, any significant tree, shrub or hedgerow works should be undertaken outside the nesting bird season (March to August inclusive) to protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than two days in advance of vegetation clearance by a competent ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.

Bats

Bats are protected under European and national legislation and in general terms, it is an offence to disturb or harm a bat, or damage or obstruct access to a roost. They will roost in buildings (often underneath loose tiles or lifted weatherboarding, or in gaps/cracks in the fabric of a building), as well as in trees, if suitable features and conditions are available.

Following best practice guidelines for buildings with low potential, one follow-up dusk emergence survey is recommended to determine presence/absence and provide suitable mitigation to safeguard bats if present and affected by the proposals. Emergence surveys can only be carried out in the summer months when bats are active, usually between May and August, or September if the weather remains warm.

Although the initial bat inspection was undertaken in March, the report was submitted in May when the recommended emergence survey could have been carried out. Consequently, my advice is the application should not be determined until the outstanding emergence survey has been undertaken, and the results submitted to the LPA for written approval. This is because bats are classified as European Protected Species and sufficient information is required to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to determination, so it can consider the impact of the proposals on bats and discharge its legal obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). In the summer months, all recommended bat surveys should be completed before determination of an application.

I trust these comments are of assistance

In light of these comments, the applications determination period was delayed until the recommended emergence surveys could take place. Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys were carried out on 3 October 2021 by Beth Ellison-Perrett of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. And submitted to the LPA. Hertfordshire Ecology provided the following comments on receipt of these surveys.

Following an initial daytime assessment in March 2021 when the building was assessed to have low potential for roosting bats, one follow-on dusk emergence / dawn re-entry survey was recommended to determine presence/absence and provide appropriate mitigation if required.

I am pleased to see the following bat report has now been submitted: Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys, 3 October 2021 prepared by Arbtech Consulting. One emergence and one re-entry survey were undertaken two weeks apart in September. Low activity of three species of bats were recorded flying (foraging/commuting) across the site, but no bats were recorded emerging from or re-entering the building. As roosting is not confirmed, no further surveys or mitigation licence is required for this proposal.

I consider the LPA now has sufficient information on bats to satisfy the third test of the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and for determination.

The Recommendations/Mitigation in Table 4 on page 11 of the report should be followed.

4.2 Public/Neighbour Consultation

4.2.1 Number consulted: 12

4.2.2 Neighbours re-consulted for 21 days following amendments, expired 22.08.2021

4.2.3 No of responses received: 0

4.2.4 Site Notice: Not applicable Press notice: Not applicable

5 Reason for Delay

5.1 To conduct and submit bat surveys.

6 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

In July 2021, the revised NPPF 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

6.2.1 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.

6.2.2 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, CP8, CP9, CP10 and CP12.

6.2.3 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 It is noted that this application follows a similar scheme which was withdrawn under planning application reference number 20/2479/FUL. The differences between the current application and the withdrawn scheme are listed below:

- A rear patio is not proposed and instead four steps would lead down from the proposed single storey rear element to the existing garden level.
- A single storey front extension is proposed
- A new pitched roof is proposed over the existing and proposed side extension with a maximum height to match the host dwelling instead of being set down from the existing ridge.

7.2 Impact on Character and Street Scene

7.2.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) seeks to promote buildings of a high enduring design quality that respect local distinctiveness. Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area' and 'conserve and enhance natural and heritage assets'.

7.2.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) set out that development should not lead to a gradual deterioration in the quality of the built environment, have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area and that extensions should respect the existing character of the dwelling, particularly with regard to the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors, and materials. As set out Appendix 2, single storey rear extensions to semi-detached dwellings should generally have a maximum depth of 3.6m. The Design Criteria states this

distance may be reduced if the extension would adversely affect adjoining properties or is unduly prominent. Further, first floor extensions shall be a minimum of 1.2m from the flank boundary.

- 7.2.3 The proposed single storey rear extension would extend to a depth of 3.6m beyond the existing rear elevation which would comply with the criteria outlined above. Given its siting to the rear it would not be readily visible from the streetscene. The host dwelling is located within a large site and the application site would retain a large rear garden. As such, the proposed ground floor rear element of the proposal would not appear disproportionate to the host dwelling or application site.
- 7.2.4 The proposed development would result in the extension of the existing part single, part two storey side element to the front and rear and would include the conversion of the existing garage. The single storey front element would have width of 2.9m, to adjoin the converted garage and would project approximately 1.7m further forward than the existing bay window; however, it would extend no further forward than the existing garage (to be converted). Whilst this would be readily visible from the streetscene, it would appear subordinate in scale of the host dwelling and would not be unduly prominent within the streetscene.
- 7.2.5 The extension to the rear of the existing two storey addition would project 2.1m at first floor level and would have a width of 3.3m to be set in line with the non-recessed element of the existing first floor elevation. Whilst this would increase the depth of the north eastern flank elevation and would be readily visible from the streetscene, given the spacing and separation between the host dwelling at No. 22, it is not considered that it would result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Given the splayed nature of the common boundary, increasing the width of the plot towards the front, it mitigates the visual bulk and massing of the extension when viewed from an oblique angle within the wider streetscene or Sheffield Avenue.
- 7.2.6 The splayed side would also, have the effect of reducing the visual bulk of the development and prevent a massing of extension when viewed from an oblique angle within the wider streetscene or Sheffield Avenue.
- 7.2.7 Whilst the proposed development would result in the construction on a new roof over the existing and proposed side extension, it is noted that the adjoining semi-detached at No. 26 has implemented a part single part two storey front side and rear extension which the amended proposal would seek to mirror as currently the pair of semi-detached properties are unbalanced. Further the existing flat roofed side extension to the north-eastern flank is not considered to enhance the character and appearance of the host dwelling. the proposal would introduce a hipped roof, which whilst adding greater bulk and massing at an elevated height to the north-eastern flank in comparison to the existing circumstances, would reflect the materials and design of the main roof of the host dwelling and would enhance the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene. Furthermore, the existing ridge line of the host dwelling would be maintained. Alterations to the existing balcony are proposed to enclose the flanks and add a hipped roof. Whilst front balconies are often uncharacteristic, there are other existing examples along Sheffield Avenue, such that it would not appear out of character. Whilst front balconies are often uncharacteristic, there are other existing examples along Sheffield Avenue, such that it would not appear out of character.
- 7.2.8 While the proposed development would significantly alter the appearance of the application dwelling, Sheffield Avenue does include developments of a similar size and style. The extensions would comply with Appendix 2 in terms of their depth and spacing to the flank boundary and as a consequence, the proposed development would not result in the application dwelling becoming unduly prominent or out of character to the detriment of the wider street scene or the area.

- 7.2.9 In summary, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any significant adverse impact on the character or appearance of the host dwelling, street scene or area and the proposal would be acceptable in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document.
- 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 of disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space'.
- 7.3.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not result in the loss of light to the windows of neighbouring properties nor allow overlooking, and should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties. Further, two storey development at the rear of properties should not intrude into a 45 degree splay line.
- 7.3.3 The proposed single storey front extension would be largely screened from view by the proposed two storey front projection and as such would not result in any harm to the visual amenities of the neighbouring property at No. 22. The proposed single storey front extension given its scale and siting, set in from the common boundary with No. 26, would not give rise to any harm to the visual amenities of the adjoining neighbour at No. 26. The proposed development would increase the bulk of the dwelling and in particular increase the massing on the north-eastern side closest to neighbour no. 22. Although extensive on the north-eastern side, the development will be set in from the shared splayed boundary by 4.2m to the front decreasing to 2.3m at the rear, complying with the criteria detailed within Appendix 2. This neighbour benefits from several ground floor extensions to the north-east and projects beyond the existing rear elevation of the host dwelling. It is also set off the common boundary and is angled away from the host dwelling. Given that the proposed development would be set off the boundary with this neighbour, it is not considered that the proposed extensions would cause any loss of light or be an overbearing form of development as experienced by this neighbour. Further, the submitted proposed plans demonstrate that the proposed two storey development would not intrude the 45 degree splay line drawn across the rear garden from a point on the joint boundary, level with the rear wall of north-eastern neighbour at No. 22. As such, the two storey rear extension would comply with the criteria set out within Appendix 2.
- 7.3.4 The proposed development would include a single storey rear extension which would project 3.6m beyond the existing rear elevation set in line with the existing flank elevations. With a depth of 3.6m, it would comply with the design criteria outlined above. Whilst it would project approximately 1.1m deeper than the rear elevation of No.22, it would be set in from the common boundary by a minimum of 2.3 and a maximum of 4.2 with the neighbour at No. 22 also set in from the common boundary and angled away. As such, it is not considered that it would result in an overbearing form of development towards this neighbour. Furthermore, it is not considered that the roof is excessive.
- 7.3.5 The proposed extension on the south-western side closest to the adjoining neighbour No. 26 is a single storey extension with a depth of 3.6m and a maximum height of 3.9m (at its highest point), set up to the common boundary. Its depth would comply with Appendix 2 guidelines. Whilst set up to the common boundary with a maximum height of 3.9m, it is noted that the neighbouring dwelling at No. 26 is located to the south, as such it is not considered given the orientation of the sun that the proposed development would result in any loss of light to No. 26. Furthermore, it is not considered that the roof is excessive.
- 7.3.6 The proposed two storey development would be visible from the rear of no.26 however, it is located to the opposite side of the dwelling, set away from this neighbour by 5.9m and the proposed two storey element would not project beyond the existing rear elevation. As

such, the two storey elements would not cause any loss of light or have an adverse impact on this neighbour.

- 7.3.7 The ground and first floor glazing including within the rear elevation of the proposed extension would primarily overlook the private amenity space of the application dwelling. As such, it is not considered that any overlooking would occur towards the neighbours. Additionally, the rooflights proposed within the rear roof slope of the single storey rear extension would have a limited outlook and are not considered to facilitate any unacceptable overlooking to this neighbour.
- 7.3.8 The ground and first floor glazing, including the Juliet balcony within the front elevation are set back from the highway and would primarily overlook the front garden and driveway of the application site. Furthermore, the view from the windows located within the proposed development would not provide a materially different view to the existing fenestration and therefore are considered acceptable. Steps are proposed from the rear of the proposed extension leading to the existing garden level. As such, it is not considered that any unacceptable overlooking would occur.
- 7.3.9 A window is proposed within the north-eastern flank of the side extension at ground floor level to serve the utility room. Given its siting, it is considered that it could result in unacceptable overlooking to no. 22. As such the proposed window would be conditioned to be obscure glazed window and non-opening within any grant of planning permission to safeguard and overlooking or loss of privacy to No. 22.
- 7.3.10 Although increasing the bulk of the dwelling, the proposed development is not considered to result in any adverse impact upon neighbouring properties and is acceptable in accordance with Policy C12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document (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. The proposal would result in a four bedroom property. The Design Guidelines (Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document) set out that a four bedroom dwelling should provide 105sqm amenity space.
- 7.4.2 The application site would retain in excess of 250m of amenity space following implementation of the proposed development for future occupiers and as such would exceed the standards and is considered acceptable in this regard.

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 The protection of biodiversity and protected species is a material planning consideration in the assessment of this application in accordance with Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD. National Planning Policy requires Local Authorities to ensure that a protected species survey is undertaken for applications where biodiversity may be affected prior to the determination of a planning application.

7.5.3 Hertfordshire Ecology were consulted as part of this planning application. An initial bat inspection was undertaken in March 2021 and a bat report submitted in May when the recommended emergence survey could have been carried out. As such, the proposal could not be determined until the outstanding emergence survey was undertaken. The Bat Survey including Bat Emergence and Re-entry Surveys which were carried out on 3 October 2021 by Beth Ellison-Perrett of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. and Hertfordshire Ecology raise no objection but suggest that the Recommendations/Mitigations outlined in Table 4 on page 11 of the report should be followed. These include that low impact strategies are adopted for any external lighting according to guidelines and that in the unlikely event that bats are unexpectedly found during any stage of dwelling, work should stop immediately and a suitable qualified ecologist should be contacted to seek further advice.

7.5.4 As such the proposal is in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP9 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013)

7.6 Trees and Landscaping

7.6.1 Policy DM6 of the DMP 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 located within a Conservation Area and no trees on or adjacent to the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. No trees of public amenity value would be harmed or removed by virtue of the proposal and the development is considered acceptable in this regard.

7.7 Highways, Access and Parking

7.7.1 Core Strategy Policy CP10 (adopted October 2011) requires development to make adequate provision for all users, including car parking. Policy DM13 in the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013) states that development should make provision for parking in accordance with the Parking Standards set out within Appendix 5.

7.7.2 The indicative parking guideline for a 4 bedroom dwelling is 3 assigned spaces. Whilst the existing garage would be lost, the application site contains a driveway with provision for at least 3 vehicles. As such the proposal would comply with the Parking Standards set out within Appendix 5.

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: KV001 and KV005 TRDC001 (Location Plan) TRDC002 (Block Plan).

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 Unless specified on the approved plans, all new works or making good to the retained fabric shall be finished to match in size, colour, texture and profile those of the existing building.
- Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).
- C4 Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted, the window within the north-eastern flank at ground floor level serving the utility room; shall be fitted with purpose made obscured glazing and shall be top level opening only at 1.7m above the floor level of the room in which the window is installed. The window shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.
- Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).
- C5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any other revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows or similar openings [other than those expressly authorised by this permission] shall be constructed in the flank elevations or roof slopes of the extensions 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 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the mitigation measures set out within Table 4 (page 11) of the Bat Emergence and Re-entry Survey prepared by Beth Ellison-Perrett of Arbtch Consulting Ltd and conducted on 3rd October 2021 shall be implemented in full on site and permanently retained as such thereafter.
- Reason: This condition is required to ensure 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).

8.2 **Informatives:**

- I1 With regard to implementing this permission, the applicant is advised as follows:
- All relevant planning conditions must be discharged prior to the commencement of work. Requests to discharge conditions must be made by formal application. Fees are £116 per request (or £34 where the related permission is for extending or altering a dwellinghouse or other development in the curtilage of a dwellinghouse). Please note that requests made without the appropriate fee will be returned unanswered.
- There may be a requirement for the approved development to comply with the Building Regulations. Please contact Hertfordshire Building Control (HBC) on 0208 207 7456 or at buildingcontrol@hertfordshirebc.co.uk who will be happy to advise you on building control matters and will protect your interests throughout your build project by leading the compliance process. Further information is available at www.hertfordshirebc.co.uk.
- 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.

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

Where possible, energy saving and water harvesting measures should be incorporated. Any external changes to the building which may be subsequently required should be discussed with the Council's Development Management Section prior to the commencement of work.

- 13 The applicant is reminded that the Control of Pollution Act 1974 allows local authorities to restrict construction activity (where work is audible at the site boundary). In Three Rivers such work audible at the site boundary, including deliveries to the site and running of equipment such as generators, should be restricted to 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- 14 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in its consideration of this planning application, in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority suggested modifications to the development during the course of the application and the applicant and/or their agent submitted amendments which result in a form of development that maintains/improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.
- 15 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

or an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist.

(As an alternative to proceeding with caution, the applicant may wish to commission an ecological consultant before works start to determine whether or not bats are present).