

	PART A	Item Number
Report to: Development Management Section Head		
To Committee	Date of Committee: 25th January 2017	
Site address:	The Wellspring Church Centre 1 Wellspring Way, Watford, WD17 2AH	
Reference no:	16/01611/FUL	
Description of development:	Erection of a two storey wrap-around extension with new entrance (change to previously approved phase 2 scheme 09/00315).	
Applicant:	Mr. J. Williams The Wellspring Church Centre 1 Wellspring Way, Watford, WD17 2AH	
Date received:	22nd November 2016	
8 week date (minor):	19th January 2017	
Ward:	Central	

Summary

The Wellspring is a modern church which was granted planning permission in 2009. That permission allowed it to be built in two phases: so far only Phase I has been built, which opened seven years ago. The second phase was to have been a two storey extension to the rear of the main church to make it longer, and a ground floor wrap-around side and rear extension with a flat roof.

Work must *commence* on a development within three years of the grant of planning permission – otherwise the permission expires; but there is no limit as to when the work must *finish*. In this case, as phases I and II were allowed by the same planning permission they are regarded as one “*development*”; and as work on Phase I commenced within three years of the permission having been granted, the effect is that the planning permission will never expire, and so Phase II could be built at any time. If the church wanted to build Phase II to the same design that was approved in 2009 it would not be necessary for them to apply again. However they have changed their minds about the design, and for that reason a new planning permission is required – hence this application.

The main differences between the Phase II scheme that was approved in 2009 and the extension that is now proposed are that the flat-roofed side and rear wrap-around element is now to be double storey rather than single, and that it is to be finished in brick, which is a higher quality material and more in keeping with the character of the area than the white render that was previously approved.

Another element of Phase II is that the main church building with its curved roof is to be lengthened – that is again proposed in this application, and this element of the design has not changed significantly from the previously approved Phase II scheme.

Background

Site and Surroundings

The site is the Wellspring Church. This building was completed a few years ago (under planning permission 09/00315/FULM which was granted in 2009). Only the first phase of the project has been constructed so far. The church's intention has always been that the second phase will be a ground floor extension at the side and the rear.

The church stands between the rear of Watford Museum (which is a grade II listed building), and a new housing development known as Pump House Crescent. The church was built first, and Pump House Crescent was built shortly afterwards. Both developments were on land that had originally been occupied by a brewery (the museum being the only surviving building – it was the brewery's office), then by a public swimming pool; and following the demolition of that pool in 2000 the land had stood empty for several years.

Watford Museum

Watford Museum stands next to the site – the rear of the museum being separated from the side of the church and its lawn by an access road leading to Dyson Court, which is sheltered housing for the elderly. The museum is a Grade II listed building. The following text about it is taken from our document Nationally Listed Buildings In Watford 2011:

Original Listing Information:

1775 large red brick mansion. Three storeys parapet and slate roof. Two storey wings added circa 1807. Centre 5 window range, centre 3 bays breaking forward with pediment over. Bulls-eye window in pediment. Wood dentil cornice. Gauged brick flat heads to windows, glazing bar sashes. C19 central doorcase with hood on console brackets. To rear 2 full height curved bays with triple windows, added circa 1807. Wings 3 window range, parapets, altered. Rainwater head on north side dated 1775, with initials J A D possibly

Dyson, brewers on the site. Head office of Benskin's brewery from 1868. Interior mostly altered during C19.

Additional Information:

When this house was built in 1775 it was the home of Edmund Dawson. Later, it passed to John Dyson and then to Joseph Benskin. At first the Benskin family lived there but in time the house became the Company's head office and it continued to be brewery offices until the entire site was bought by Watford Council in 1975. The house now accommodates Watford Museum which opened in 1981.

Ref. 10/66. Listing date: 15/09/1982 Listing grade: II

Proposed Development

Full planning permission is sought for a two storey side and rear extension to the church.

The main differences between the Phase II scheme that was approved in 2009 by planning permission 09/00315/FULM (which remains extant) and the extension that is now proposed are that the flat-roofed side and rear wrap-around element is now to be double storey, and that it is to be finished in brick, which is a higher quality material and more in keeping with the character of the area than the white render that was previously approved.

Another element of Phase II is that the main church building with its curved roof is to be lengthened (occupying space that is currently a timber-clad fire escape stair). That is again proposed in this application, and this element has not changed significantly from the previously approved Phase II scheme.

Besides its main use as a place of worship, the Wellspring Church is also used for various ancillary community uses, and to that end the proposed extensions would include rooms that would be used as a new reception area, dual purpose meeting rooms / children's rooms, a parent and child room with a buggy store and baby changing area, a rear family entrance, a family lounge, a youth and family office, interview rooms, a small hall, a youth room, a break out space, a vestry, and an extension to the first floor auditorium.

The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement

Planning History

Planning permission 09/00315/FULM was granted on 11th June 2009 for the erection of a new church building, including rooms for community use. This was a similar scheme to one that had previously been granted planning permission 08/00301/FULM in June 2008,

but it had been found that the first scheme could not be implemented due to a mistake on the plan regarding the position of a boundary, and so it had been necessary to apply again for a similar scheme in which the church was moved approximately one metre towards the museum.

There were subsequently some applications to discharge various conditions of planning permission 09/00315/FULM, and also some Advertisement Consent applications for signage. There were also some applications for planning permission to make alterations to the parking and outdoor areas.

There was also an application to vary the permissible opening hours: 11/01049/VAR was approved in 2011, varying Condition 13 of planning permission 09/00315/FULM. The newly amended condition allowed the church to hold activities between 07:30 and 23:00, except on days when the church is used as a polling station when the premises may open at 06:30, and except on Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve when the premises may remain open until 01:00 the following morning.

The present application has followed a Pre-Application Enquiry (15/01314/PREAPP). The draft plans that were initially shown to the Council in September 2015 were considered unacceptable in design terms, and advice was given on that design in a letter of 16.10.2015. A year later, in September 2016, a revised scheme was shown to the Council, which had been redesigned in the light of the advice that had been given. The planning officer and the Conservation Team Leader met with the applicant (08.09.2016) and advised that this revised design was likely to be acceptable in principle. The scheme that is now before us is similar to that second draft design that was seen by officers in September 2016.

Relevant Policies

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and seeks to make the planning system less complex and more accessible, to protect the environment and to promote sustainable growth. The NPPF was published on 27th March 2012 and is a material consideration in planning decisions. It does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Statements have been cancelled and replaced by the NPPF. Particularly relevant sections are:

Requiring Good Design

Decision Taking

Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

The Development Plan

In accordance with s.38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Development Plan for Watford comprises:

- (a) *Watford Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2006-31 (adopted Jan 2013)*
- (b) the continuing “saved” policies of the *Watford District Plan 2000*
- (c) the *Hertfordshire Waste Core Strategy And Development Management Policies Document 2011-2026*
- (d) the *Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan Review 2002-2016*

Watford Local Plan, Part 1: Core Strategy 2006-2031

This document was adopted on 30th January 2013. The following sections are particularly relevant to this case:

- UD1 Delivering High Quality Design
- UD2 Built Heritage Conservation

The Watford District Plan 2000 (saved policies)

Many of the policies in this plan were replaced on 30th January 2013 when the Watford Local Plan, Part 1 was adopted, but some of them were saved. None of those are particularly relevant to this application.

Hertfordshire Waste Core Strategy And Development Management Policies Document 2011-2026

There are no policies that are relevant to this case.

Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan (saved policies)

There are no policies that are relevant to this case.

Background Documents

Nationally Listed Buildings In Watford 2014

Consultations

Neighbour consultations

80 neighbouring properties were sent consultations letters. These included addresses on Pumphouse Crescent, on the High Street, and at the retirement flats of Dyson Court. Two site notices were put up on 12.12.2016, and a press notice was published in the Watford Observer local newspaper on 09.12.2016.

32 responses were received, all of which were objections. All but two of those were

identically worded letters from residents of Dyson Court. Of the other two, one was from another resident of Dyson Court, and the other was from someone who lives elsewhere but who works as a volunteer at Watford Museum. Please see the section of this report below entitled Consideration of Objections Received.

Statutory consultations

None were necessary. The adjacent Listed Building at Watford Museum is Grade II, and so it has not been a requirement in this case that Historic England be consulted – that applies only when a proposed development has the potential to affect the setting of a Grade I or Grade II* listed building (albeit the potential impact on any Listed Building is an important consideration that must be taken into account by the Local Planning Authority).

Internal consultations

The Conservation team have been consulted because the proposed development would be adjacent to the rear of Watford Museum, which is a Grade II listed building. Comments were received from the Urban Design and Conservation Manager on 09.01.2017, and those are reproduced below in the *Appraisal: Design* section of this report.

Appraisal

The Wellspring is a modern church which was granted planning permission in 2009. That permission (09/00315/FUL) allowed it to be built in two phases, and so far only Phase I has been built. The second phase was to have been two storey extension to the rear of the main church to make it longer, and a ground floor wrap-around side and rear extension with a flat roof.

Work must *commence* on a development within three years of the grant of planning permission – otherwise the permission expires; but there is no limit as to when the work must *finish*. In this case, as phases I and II were allowed by the same planning permission they are regarded as one “*development*”; and as work on Phase I commenced within three years of the permission having been granted, the effect is that the planning permission will never expire, and so Phase II could be built at any time. If the church wanted to build Phase II to the same design that was approved in 2009 it would not be necessary for them to apply again – they could simply start building it. However they have changed their minds about the design, and for that reason a new planning permission is required – hence this application.

Therefore, in principle, the proposal to build a side and rear extension to the church is not in contention – planning permission has already been granted for that, and the permission

remains extant. Our task must be to consider whether those respects in which this application differs from the previously approved scheme are acceptable.

The main differences between the Phase II scheme that was approved in 2009 and the extension that is now proposed are that the side and rear flat-roofed extension, which was to have been single storey, is now to be double storey, and finished in bricks rather than in render. There has been no significant change as regards the other element of Phase II which is to lengthen the main church building with its curved roof.

Design /Impact on the neighbouring Listed Building

The Urban Design and Conservation Manager has provided the following comments, assessing the proposed design:

This application involves extensions to the new church at Wellspring; it was always expected that the church would expand their activities on this site and that this would involve extensions to the side and rear of the existing building. The proposals also involve the relocation of the storage shed and bike storage.

The main issues in this case are the relationship of the extensions to the existing building and whether there is any impact on the setting of the Grade II listed Museum building.

Listed Building: the applicants were advised to consider the relationship of the side extension to the rear elevation of the museum. During the pre-application process this was discussed and the applicants heeded advice to set the upper floor back from the building line and to minimise any impact to the setting of the museum building. The applicants were also advised to keep the building design simple so that it would not compete with the design of the rear elevation of the museum which has two distinctive semi-circular bays. It was recommended that the height of the eaves of the new building should not exceed that of the museum.

Existing building: In terms of the relationship to the existing building the extensions should complement the existing and remain subservient elements.

Comments on the scheme:

Bulk and massing: the proposed extension successfully wraps round the existing building (includes an extension to the main building in the same manner). The ground and first floor wrap sections are subservient to the principal building and are set far enough away from the listed building to avoid compromising the setting of the building further than it already has been through various developments over the years. The elevations have strong but simple detailing – cornice and parapet designs with good vertical articulation

through a simple fenestration pattern. The setting back of the first floor element allows this to recede and the line of the cornice and parapet to be the stronger visual lines. The first floor is also glazed which reduces further the visual impact of the first floor.

Elevations: the vertical articulation is simple and effective creating a good rhythm along the elevation to the museum. Care will be needed with the addition to the principal building so that materials match well and that the point where the bricks join is executed to minimise the visibility of the join. The creation of a new entrance feature with some colour will enhance the overall design of the building. Care will be needed to ensure that the first floor sections avoid any overlooking to Dyson Court – use of obscure glazing could ensure this. Also, there should be no access to the area behind the parapet other than for maintenance purposes.

Materials: in principle these are acceptable but samples should be seen to sign them off before construction. One item which will need care is the grills above the single bay windows – these will be quite prominent and it would be good to get a decent looking one here, so can we ask for samples of this as well and possibly details of how it will be set into the wall. Also, can we ensure that there will be good reveals for the windows.

Landscape: the fence shown is more acceptable for domestic buildings but is already being used there; it would be helpful to have a better quality boundary treatment where this is required; it may be possible to remove some of the higher boundary treatment in places depending on the use of the spaces on either side. Can we condition the landscape materials as well – hard surfaces are quite important to the setting of the buildings here.

In conclusion the proposed extensions are acceptable and can be approved subject to conditions. No harm would be caused to the setting of the listed building by the proposed extensions.

End of comments from the Urban Design and Conservation Manager

Bricks

It is proposed that the extensions will be finished in brick, which is a higher quality material and more in keeping with the character of the area than the white render that was previously approved.

The side elevation will include numerous large windows, and the first floor will be stepped back. These features will break up the development to avoid it appearing unduly bulky or oppressive.

Apparently the original bricks are no longer manufactured, so it would be very difficult to obtain enough identical bricks for the whole development. While it should be possible to find some that were a close match, the risk is that they would always look slightly different, which would give the extension the appearance of having failed to properly match the original building. This problem was discussed between planning officers and the applicants at pre-application stage, and it was agreed that the best solution (as regards the wrap-around flat-roofed side and rear element of the extension) was to use a brick that complements the original building, without attempting to match it. A grey brick is considered best, as a different shade of red or a lighter colour would stand out more, drawing attention away from the original church, and away from the listed museum building. The same approach has been used successfully a few years ago on the extension to the Colosseum concert hall, adjacent to the Town Hall, where grey bricks were used for the extension of a red brick historic building.

The other part of the proposed Phase II extension is the lengthening of the main church building with its curved roof, which will become 7m longer at the rear. For that part of the development it is essential that bricks are used which match the originals. When this problem was discussed at pre-application stage the applicants' agent was of the opinion that, although the bricks are no longer manufactured, it might be possible to source the relatively small quantities that would be needed for this part of the development from various sources.

A condition should be applied requiring the submission of sample bricks for approval by the Council before works commence – this should cover not only the grey bricks for the wrap-around flat-roofed element, but also the red bricks that must match the originals for the lengthening of the main church. This is important. If the applicants were to find that, despite their optimism, they cannot source sufficient quantities of matching bricks for the lengthening of the main church building, that would present them with a problem, and it might mean that this planning permission cannot be implemented.

Impact on neighbouring properties

The Design and Access Statement that was submitted along with the drawings includes a page of shadow diagrams, showing how the proposed extension would cast its shadow at various times of the day in June. It shows that the development would not overshadow Dyson Court or any other residential neighbours.

Although it is to be a two storey extension, the design has sought to reduce its visual impact by giving the side element a flat roof and by setting its first floor back. The flat roof will be kept below the eaves of the curved roof of the existing church. This will help to avoid the development being overbearing towards the retirement flats at Dyson Court.

The proposed development also includes the lengthening of the main church building itself, and that will involve simply extending the existing structure and its curved roof by approximately 7m. The flank wall facing the houses of Pumphouse Crescent currently has three tall windows, but it would gain a fourth, which would be where the timber clad fire-escape stairs currently stand. This lengthening of the main church building will have some impact on a few of the houses on Pumphouse Crescent in that it will affect the outlook from their front windows and front doors. However this aspect of the proposed design is the same as that which was previously approved as Phase II of planning permission 09/00315/FUL; and that planning permission remains extant and could be lawfully implemented. At the time of writing this report (10.01.2017) no objections have been received from anyone living on Pumphouse Crescent. That residential development was built after Phase I of the church was built; so anyone who has bought a home on Pumphouse Crescent should (if they or their solicitor looked on-line to see the planning permission for the church) have been aware that permission had already been granted to lengthen the church building to the rear in this way.

Parking and transport

Currently the church has a few parking spaces at the side and a few at the rear. They are intended mainly for dropping off, deliveries and short term parking, and for the use of disabled people. Ordinary members of the congregation are expected to arrive on foot, as this site is ideally suited for access on foot or by public transport, being in the town centre and adjacent to a station.

The rear boundary of the site has a dog-leg. Currently the rear lawn is deeper in one section, and it is behind that deeper section that the church has its rear parking bays – those are on one side only. Parking bays behind the part of the lawn that is less deep are on both sides, but they do not belong to the church – some are for Dyson Court and some are for the museum.

No changes are proposed to the parking arrangements. The church's parking bays are to be retained, and the development will not affect any of the parking spaces for the museum or for Dyson Court.

The section of the existing lawn that projects the most deeply will have a new outbuilding erected on it for storing rubbish and recycling bins and for bicycles – so anyone who cycles to the church will have a secure and weatherproof store in which to park their bicycle. It is shown on the ground floor plan and on a 3D image, but not on an elevation drawing. It is not clear what materials it would be made of. As little detail has been given about the height or the materials for that outbuilding, conditions should be applied to ask for further

detail on the materials and to limit the height to 2.5m.

Consideration of objections received

32 representations have been received, and all but one of those have been from residents of the retirement flats at Dyson Court. All of the respondents objected to the proposal. The only letter that was not from Dyson Court was from someone who lives elsewhere but who works as a volunteer at Watford Museum.

Of the 31 letters that were received from Dyson Court, all except one were identically worded but with different names and signatures, and they were delivered to the Town Hall as a bundle. Evidently they were typed and printed out by one person, but signed by the individuals whose names they bear; so in effect these letters can be considered as a petition. There was one letter from a resident of Dyson Court that was different, having evidently been written by the person whose name it bears.

The Wellspring Church have informed us that they have also held two consultation events of their own in December. One was a public drop-in event at the church, and the other was a presentation to the residents of Dyson Court. It seems that the letters of objection that we received from various residents of Dyson Court were delivered to us prior to their meeting with the applicants.

The following table contains a summary of the points that were raised.

Points Raised	Officer's Response
The application only mentions Dyson Court once, and fails to say that it is a retirement home.	The Council are aware that Dyson Court is a retirement home and that it is a neighbour of the site.
The needs of elderly residents of Dyson Court should not be impeded: such as access for visitors, carers, ambulances and other emergency services, and space for using mobility scooters and walking aids.	There is no proposal to build anything that would impede access to and from Dyson Court.
The flats opposite the new extension might be overlooked, or suffer from perceived overlooking because of the development's close proximity.	A condition will ensure that the rear first floor windows will be obscurely glazed (they would only serve an escape corridor, stores and the vestry), and that the spaces behind the first floor parapets cannot be used as balconies.
Because the church will become larger it is possible that events will be held there more	A condition will require that further details of the windows must be submitted for

<p>often, and this could cause a noise nuisance to neighbours.</p>	<p>approval. This will enable the Council to ensure that they will provide an adequate level of soundproofing.</p>
<p>The sun diagrams do not make it clear whether Dyson Court would suffer a reduction in natural light.</p>	<p>The sun movement diagrams are included in the Design and Access Statement. They show that the shadow cast by the development would not reach Dyson Court.</p>
<p>There is already insufficient parking provision for the church, with all available spaces being taken during services, plus some metered spaces on the High Street. With the reduction in parking spaces to the rear, pressure on parking spaces will be increased, given the expanded size of the church. This will reduce the number of parking spaces locally that will be available to residents of Dyson Court and their visitors.</p>	<p>This site is ideally located for access on foot or by public transport, being in the Town Centre and adjacent to a station. It was always envisaged that the congregation and users of the church would arrive on foot – that was the case with Phase I and it remains the case with Phase II. Given how well located the church is for car-free travel, it would be impossible to justify a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of inadequate parking provision – such a refusal would certainly be overturned at appeal.</p>
<p>The application states that the church will serve the community, but is there a geographical or time limit on who constitutes “the community”? The further people come from, the more likely it is that they will use cars, and the greater the environmental impact will be.</p>	<p>The Planning system cannot legitimately be used to limit the catchment area of a church.</p>
<p>It is already difficult to turn vehicles to the rear of the site, and this is likely to become worse with more traffic movements.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed to the parking area. There is no reason to suppose that the development would cause a significant increase in traffic movements.</p>
<p>Residents of Dyson Court worry that people visiting them on Sundays will find it difficult to park.</p>	<p>Dyson Court will not lose any of its parking spaces.</p>
<p>The section of the Design and Access Statement that refers to the pre-application advice is incomplete, and so is the section dealing with the impact on the listed museum building.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Because some boxes in the application form have been left blank it is not clear what the closing time of the premises will be.</p>	<p>A condition is recommended (see the list at the end of this report) to make it clear that the permitted opening and closing times</p>

	remain the same as those that have already been set for the existing church.
One respondent notes approvingly that pre-application advice has been given, and that it seems that the design has been improved as a result of that.	The design that is now before us is indeed a considerable improvement over the scheme that was first shown to us with a pre-application enquiry in 2015.
The proposal to use grey bricks will make the development appear dreary and oppressive. Would it not be better to use bricks that match the original church?	Please see the section of this report above entitled Bricks.
How will the extension be built without blocking access to the parking areas for the museum and for Dyson Court? Where will materials be stored during the work? Will a construction environment management plan be required?	These matters relate to the construction phase of the development process and are not material planning considerations.
Taking the church building to the extremes of the site will greatly reduce the open space and the outlook in and around the front of the two entrances, and the small parking area left to Dyson Court. This will reduce natural light to the front of Dyson Court.	The front of the extension will be set well back (8.5m) behind the front of the existing church, leaving a paved courtyard in front of the new entrance. There will be some open space (albeit only a metre or so) between the rear of the building and the rear boundary fence. It has always been intended that Phase II would largely cover the grass and paved areas at the side and rear of the church – permission to do that was granted from the outset in 2009, and that permission remains extant (albeit the design that is now proposed has changed).
The plan shows an X marking a space at the rear of the church between the bin store and the fence, which is for a ramp. Will there be access into the church car park?	Yes. A pedestrian gate is proposed beside the refuse and bicycle outbuilding. It would give access to the family entrance / escape lobby.

Conclusion

Planning permission has already been granted in 2009 (and remains extant) for a Phase II extension at the side and the rear of the church, so the principle of the development has been approved, and there are only minor differences as regards the footprint of the development that is now proposed. The main difference between the newly proposed

design and the previously approved scheme is that it is now to be double storey, and that it is to be finished in brick, which is a higher quality material and more in keeping with the character of the area than the white render that was previously approved. The new scheme is considered to be well designed, it will remain subordinate to the main church building and it will not harm the setting of the adjacent listed museum building. It will not cause significantly more harm to the amenity of neighbouring residential premises than the previously approved scheme would have done.

Human rights implications

The Local Planning Authority is justified in interfering with the applicant's Human Rights in order to alleviate any adverse effect on adjoining properties and their occupiers and on general public amenity. With regard to any infringement of third party Human Rights, these are not considered to be of such a nature and degree as to override the Human Rights of the applicant and therefore warrant refusal of planning permission.

Decision Level: Delegated

Recommendation: Conditional Planning Permission

Conditions

1 The development to which this permission relates shall be begun within a period of three years commencing on the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

Drawing 1510 100

Drawing 1510 101 revision C

Drawing 1510 102 revision C

Drawing 1510 103 revision B

Drawing 1510 104

Drawing 1510 105 revision B

Drawing 1510 106 revision B

3D images 1510 110

3D images 1510 111

3D images 1510 112

3D images 1510 114
3D images 1510 115
Drawing 1510 116 revision A
Drawing 1510 117 revision A
Drawing 1510 118
3D image Pln 113
Design and access statement

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3 No work shall commence above the level of the damp-course until full details of the materials listed as follows have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Physical samples, labelled with the manufacturer and product name, shall be submitted of the following: the bricks, the grilles that are to be set into the walls, the materials to be used for the entrance porch's colonnade of screens, the paving for the external spaces, the materials out of which the walls and roof of the bicycle / refuse store is to be built. Written details accompanied by colour photographs shall be submitted of the following: the fences, the roofing materials. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the site and to ensure that it does not harm the setting of the adjacent Listed museum building, pursuant to Policies UD1 (Delivering High Quality Design) and UD2 (Built Heritage Conservation) of the Watford Local Plan (Part 1: Core Strategy) 2006-2031. This is not a pre-commencement condition because it allows for work to be done below the level of the damp course before the materials are approved. In addition to aesthetic considerations, details of the glazing are required to ensure that levels of sound insulation are adequate to protect the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.

4 No work shall commence above the level of the damp-course until full details of the window and door frames, including details of the reveals into which the windows are to be set, and the glazing have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The. Details shall include produce specifications and samples adequate to determine the appearance of the windows, their level of opacity, their sounds transmittance and whether they have ventilation. development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:

- a) In the interests of the visual appearance of the site and to ensure that it does not harm the setting of the adjacent Listed museum building, pursuant to Policies UD1

(Delivering High Quality Design) and UD2 (Built Heritage Conservation) of the Watford Local Plan (Part 1: Core Strategy) 2006-2031.

- b) To ensure that levels of sound insulation are adequate to protect the amenity of neighbouring residential properties; and
- c) To ensure the relevant windows are adequately obscured as specified in condition 6 so as to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

5 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no activity shall take place within either the building or any part of its curtilage before 07:30hrs or after 23:00hrs, except on days when the premises are in use as a polling station, when the premises may open at 06:30hrs; and except on Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve when the premises may remain open until 01:00hrs on the following morning.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties pursuant to Policy SE22 of the Watford District Plan 2000. This condition is consistent with the opening hours that are currently set for the existing church by planning permission 09/00315/FULM condition 13, as varied by 11/01049/VAR.

6 No part of the flat roof of the development hereby permitted shall be used as a terrace, balcony or other open amenity space. The proposed first floor windows in the rear elevation shall be fitted with obscured glass at all times.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of the windows of neighbouring residential premises, pursuant to section 17 (point 4) of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy UD1 (Delivering High Quality Design) of the Watford Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2006-2031, and in accordance with the principles of good design that are set out in the Residential Design Guide supplementary planning document as referenced in paragraph 7.3.16 supporting Policy UD1.

7 The height of the outbuilding which is proposed for use as a bicycle and refuse / recycling store shall not exceed 2.5m unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Although it is shown in plan form and on the illustrative 3D images, the outbuilding is not detailed on the elevation drawings and therefore this condition is necessary to ensure that it is not so tall as to harm the appearance of the site or the amenity of neighbouring premises, pursuant to Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Part 1.

Informatives

1 For details of how the Local Planning Authority has reached its decision on this application please refer to the planning officer's report, which can be obtained from the Council's website www.watford.gov.uk, where it is appended to the agenda of the Development Management Committee meeting of 25 January 2017; and also to the minutes of that meeting.

2 In dealing with this application, Watford Borough Council has considered the proposal in a positive and proactive manner having regard to the policies of the development plan as well as paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and other material considerations, and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Two rounds of pre-application advice have been given to the applicants by the Council.

3 This permission does not remove the need to obtain any separate consent, which may be required under the Buildings Act 1984 or other building control legislation. Nor does it override any private rights which any person may have relating to the land affected by this decision. To find more information and for advice as to whether a Building Regulations application will be required please visit www.watfordbuildingcontrol.com.

4 You are advised of the need to comply with the provisions of The Control of Pollution Act 1974, The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, The Clean Air Act 1993 and The Environmental Protection Act 1990. In order to minimise impact of noise, any works associated with the development which are audible at the site boundary should be restricted to the following hours: Monday to Friday 8am to 6pm, Saturdays 8am to 1pm. Noisy work is prohibited on Sundays and bank holidays. Instructions should be given to ensure that vehicles and plant entering and leaving the site comply with the stated hours of work. Further details for both the applicant and those potentially affected by construction noise can be found on the Council's website at: https://www.watford.gov.uk/info/20010/your_environment/188/neighbour_complaints_%E2%80%93_construction_noise

Case Officer: Mr Max Sanders

Tel. 01923 27 8288 E-mail: max.sanders@watford.gov.uk