

<b>Committee date</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> October 2018
<b>Application reference</b>	18/00936/FULM
<b>Site address</b>	Former Happy Hour Public House, Eastbury Road
<b>Proposal</b>	Planning application for the demolition of existing building and erection of 32 dwellings together with a means of access from Eastbury Road, provision of associated parking, amenity space and landscaping.
<b>Applicant</b>	Eastbury Road Developments Ltd
<b>Agent</b>	Woolf Bond Planning
<b>Type of Application</b>	Full planning application
<b>Reason for committee item</b>	Major Application
<b>Target decision date</b>	29 <sup>th</sup> October 2018
<b>Statutory publicity</b>	Site Notice and Press Notification expiring 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2018
<b>Case officer</b>	Alice Reade <a href="mailto:alice.reamde@watford.gov.uk">alice.reamde@watford.gov.uk</a>
<b>Ward</b>	Oxhey

## 1. Recommendation

**Approve** subject to conditions and the completion of a s.106 unilateral undertaking, as set out in section 8 of this report.

## 2. Site and surroundings

- 2.1 The site is positioned fronting Eastbury Road at the junction with Silk Mill Road. It currently contains a detached two storey building formally the Happy Hour Public House with access from Eastbury Road.
- 2.2 The site is elevated slightly from the adjacent Silk Mill Road and there is a bank verge between the site and Silk Mill Road.
- 2.3 Adjacent to the north-east of the site are semi detached houses fronting Eastbury Road with No88 immediately adjacent to the site. Nos 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d Silk Mill Road are a group of terraced houses which front onto Silk Mill Road and the south-west boundary of the site. Nos 77, 77a, 79a, 79, 79b and 81 Eastbury Road are a group of two storey houses which front onto the site. To the immediate rear of the site is a public footpath beyond which are the rears of two storey flats at Longcroft.
- 2.4 The immediate context is predominantly two storey houses although there is a single storey nursery building located nearby along Eastbury Road. Further up Eastbury Road to the north east is a cluster of 3 and 4 storey flats, opposite Oxhey Park and adjacent to Bushey train station.

- 2.5 The site is within a predominantly residential area. The site is not within a conservation area and there are no listed or locally listed buildings within or adjoining the site. No trees on the site are subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

Further information is available in the appendices to the report and on our [website](#).

### **3. Summary of the proposal**

#### **3.1 Proposal**

Demolition of the existing building and erection of a residential building as follows:

- i) 32 residential units (17 no 1B2P, 10 no 2B4P and 5 no 3B5P)
- ii) 3 storey building
- iii) Car parking for 32 cars
- iv) Private amenity areas or balconies for all units plus communal amenity area.

#### **3.2 Changes to the scheme from the previous refused scheme include:**

- Removed the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor with loss of 5 units. (37 to 32 units)
- Affordable housing offer reduced from 5No. 3 bed social rent units of original scheme to 2No. 3 bed units (1 social rent and 1 affordable rent).
- No roof top amenity space
- Parking provision now 1 space to 1 unit.

#### **3.3 Conclusion**

The height of the building has been reduced to 3 storeys with the loss of the 5 units at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. This has reduced the height, scale and bulk of the building and so it has fully overcome the grounds for refusal of the previous scheme.

- 3.4 As a consequence of the reduction, the development can no longer provide a policy compliant (or equivalent) level of affordable housing. The development has been subject to a viability assessment and review by consultants. The affordable housing provision is in accordance with what can be reasonably provided by the development.

- 3.5 The relationships of the development with neighbours are fully compliant with the Residential Design Guide (RDG) and would not constitute unreasonable harm to light, outlook or privacy of neighbours. It is considered that the development would achieve the right balance of providing sufficient on site parking whilst not providing excessive parking that would worsen traffic and

congestion in the area, compliant with the 'saved' policies T22 and T24.

#### **4. Relevant policies**

Members should refer to the background papers attached to the agenda. These highlight the policy framework under which this application was determined. Specific policy considerations with regard to this particular application are detailed in section 6 below.

#### **5. Relevant site history/background information**

##### **5.1 Relevant Planning History**

18/00248/FULM Planning application for the demolition of existing building and erection of 37 dwellings, together with a means of access from Eastbury Road, provision of associated parking for 33 cars, amenity space and landscaping. (Affordable housing option A preferred for 5No.x 3bed Social rent units)

Refused at Committee 4<sup>th</sup> July 2018 for the following reasons:

1. Planning permission be refused on the grounds that the development height, scale and massing would adversely affect the character of the neighbouring residential area and as such is contrary to policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31.
2. The application has not been accompanied by a s106 agreement and fails to provide affordable housing units to meet urgent housing needs within the Borough, contrary to paragraph 50 of the NPPF and Policy HS3 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31.

Appeal Pending

17/01468/PREAPP Pre-application enquiry for redevelopment to 53 apartments.

##### **5.2 Other relevant history**

A nomination for the public house to be listed as an Asset of Community Value. was submitted under the Localism Act 2011 on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017 to the property services team of WBC. This was reviewed by the property services team in accordance with the legislation and it was determined that the public house did not merit listing as an Asset of Community Value. The retention of the public house was also supported by the submission of a petition submitted to the property services department of WBC.

#### **6. Main considerations**

##### **6.1 The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are:**

- (a) Principle of the development
- (b) Scale and design
- (c) Quality of residential accommodation
- (d) Impacts on surrounding properties
- (e) Affordable housing provision
- (f) Transport, access and servicing
- (g) Car and cycle parking
- (h) Environmental considerations

## 6.2 (a) Principle of the development

6.2.1 The site contains a vacant public house and the development would result in the loss of this premises. Saved policy CS3 of the Watford District Plan 2000 seeks to prevent the loss of community facilities. The policy does not include a public house as a community facility and refers to community, health, and education centres and churches. Nonetheless, the social benefits of a public house are acknowledged to provide community benefit.

6.2.2 The closure of the public house has however demonstrated that there may not have been sufficient demand to warrant its retention in the market. It is further noted that Watford does contain a variety of public houses. As such, it is considered that the loss of the public house would not warrant harm and is in accordance with policy CS7 of the Watford District Plan 2000.

6.2.3 It is also noted that a nomination was made under section 88 of the Localism Act 2011 to seek the retention of the pub as an Asset of Community Value. This was however not accepted as it did not meet the relevant criteria for designation due to its closure and lack of evidence to demonstrate its future success and viability as a pub. This unsuccessful application further supports that there is insufficient justification for the retention of the pub for community benefit.

6.2.4 The site is within a predominantly residential location and offers an opportunity for brownfield residential development pursuant to housing delivery required by the NPPF and also meeting housing needs pursuant to Priority 1 of the Corporate Plan for Watford Borough Council and the Core Strategy.

6.2.5 Policy HS1 of the Core Strategy lists the criteria that will be taken into account in assessing the suitability of sites for residential use. In this case, the site is brownfield land, is not at risk of flooding and has good access to public transport and a wide range of local services. Furthermore, the site has no heritage significance or biodiversity or landscape value. The residential

provision would be in keeping with the residential use of the context. The development provides a suitable mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed homes, compliant with policy HS2 of the Core Strategy.

6.2.6 For these reasons, the loss of the pub and the residential development are acceptable in policy terms and are supported in principle.

### 6.3 (b) Scale and design

6.3.1 The contemporary design approach is supported to make efficient use of the site and does not create demonstrable harm to the area. Following the refusal of the previous application for a part 3 and part 4 storey building, the height of the building has been reduced to 3 storeys only. This 3 storey, flat roof height, sits approximately level with the two storey pitched roofs of the surrounding buildings. This height would therefore be appropriate in Eastbury Road and would not appear as dominant or harmful.

6.3.2 It is further noted that the wider context includes flatted 3 and 4 storey buildings at the North-East of Eastbury Road, there is a cluster of 3 and 4 storey flat buildings and at Eastbury Court which is a 3 storey flatted building. The development would therefore be entirely appropriate within the immediate and wider context.

6.3.3 The position, layout and detailing of the building remains supported. The building respects the front building line of Eastbury Road and would sit behind the flank of No 1A Silk Mill Road meaning it would not be dominant in the street. The design of the building again includes good articulation and vertical emphasis which adds rhythm and successfully breaks up the width of the building.

6.3.4 By reducing the height of the building from part 4 storey to all 3 storey, the development has reduced the height, scale and massing of the building and fully overcome reason 1 of the previous refusal.

### 6.4 (c) Quality of residential accommodation

6.4.1 The proposal will provide 32 residential units. All will comply with the minimum floorspace of the nationally described space standard. All comply with RDG guidance and would have good levels of outlook, natural light and privacy.

6.4.2 Guidance seeks a communal amenity area for the development would be required at 530sqm in accordance with the RDG. With the loss of the top floor,

the development loses 222sqm of roof top amenity area leaving only the communal area of 76sqm at the rear of the development. Every dwelling would still benefit from an area of private amenity space with ground floor garden areas for each ground floor unit and private balconies for all first and second floor flats. The total of the private and communal amenity areas for the development would provide 511sqm of amenity area, this is only 4% short of the RDG guidance and is supported.

6.4.3 It is further noted that Oxhey Park is a short walk away from the development and this will provide a larger amenity area.

6.4.4 The development would provide high quality residential accommodation and an appropriate mix of unit sizes, pursuant to policies HS1 and HS2 of the Local Plan Core Strategy.

6.5 (d) Impacts on surrounding properties

6.5.1 *Silk Mill Road*

Nos. 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d Silk Mill Road face north-east and front onto the south-west side of the application site. The application site is also slightly elevated in relation to these properties. There is a minimum distance of 27.5m between the nearest ground floor window of this group (at No1c) and the flank of the development. The 25 degree line taken up from this window would not be infringed by the 4 storey scheme formally proposed nor the reduced scheme now under consideration. This relationship is compliant with the RDG guidance. By virtue of the distance and relationship of the development with the Silk Mill Road properties, it is not foreseen that there would be any unreasonable loss of light or outlook to the fronts of these properties. Due to the distance between the buildings and the northerly position of the development, it is not considered that it would create a dominant or overshadowing impact to the front of the Silk Mill Road properties.

6.5.2 The upper floors of the south west elevation of the development contain bedroom and habitable room windows. These would have a front to front relationship with the Silk Mill Road properties which is reasonable and indeed to be expected in a residential area and would not create harmful overlooking. Notwithstanding this, a minimum distance of 27.5m is maintained between the south west upper floor windows and the front windows of Nos1a, 1b, 1c and 1d Silk Mill Road and this is compliant with minimum privacy distances.

6.5.3 *No88 Eastbury Road*

The development would be adjacent to No 88 Eastbury Road. The three storey building adjacent to this side would be set 12m from the boundary with No88.

The building would be deeper than the building at No88 however it would not infringe the 45 degree lines taken on plan or elevation from the rear windows of No88. The relationship is fully compliant with the Residential Design Guide and would not create unacceptable loss of light, outlook or amenity for No88.

6.5.4 The north-east side elevation of the development contains side facing windows. At first floor and second floor 4 windows are secondary windows or not serving habitable rooms meaning they can be obscurely glazed/fixed closed, if this is appropriate. At second floor, there are 2 windows which are the sole windows to bedrooms and these will need to be clear glazed to allow for an outlook. All these side windows are however set in a minimum of 12m from the common boundary with the side garden boundary of No88, exceeding the 11m minimum garden depth requirement of the RDG. These windows would also not fall within the privacy arc taken from the rear windows of No88 and as such, these side windows of the development are acceptable in accordance with the RDG and would not facilitate harmful overlooking or loss of privacy. These windows are therefore not required to be restricted by condition.

6.5.5 *Longcroft*

The rear windows and balconies of the development would be sited 14m from the rear boundary of the site and 29m minimum from the rear of the Longcroft properties. These depths exceed the minimum depths of the 11m and 27.5m stated in the RDG. There is also a public footpath and row of mature trees between the two sites creating further separation and privacy. The development would sit substantially below the 25 degree line taken up from the nearest windows of the Longcroft properties (No11), compliant with the RDG. There is therefore no foreseen adverse loss of light, outlook or amenity to the Longcroft properties.

6.5.6 *Nos 77, 77a, 79a, 79, 79b and 81 Eastbury Road*

This group of houses on Eastbury Road are opposite the application site and will front onto the development. There is a minimum distance of 33m between the nearest ground floor window of this group (at No79b) and the front of the development. The 25 degree line taken up from this window would not be infringed and this relationship is compliant with the RDG guidance. By virtue of the distance and relationship of the development with the Eastbury Road properties, it is not foreseen that there would be any notable loss of light or outlook to the fronts of these properties.

6.5.7 The development includes upper floor windows and balconies on the front elevations. These would have a front to front relationship with the Eastbury Road properties which is reasonable and indeed to be expected in a

residential area and would not create harmful overlooking. Notwithstanding this, a minimum distance of 27.5m is exceeded with a distance of 33m between the frontages of the development and the Eastbury Road group. There would therefore be no unreasonable overlooking to this group.

#### 6.5.8 *Conclusion*

As with the previous scheme, all relationships between the development and surrounding properties are fully compliant with the guidance of the RDG. Compliance with all RDG guidance means that the development would not constitute harm to their amenity or reasonable enjoyment of their properties.

### 6.6 (e) Affordable housing provision

6.6.1 The previous application was presented to Committee with two options for affordable housing provision. Option B was fully policy compliant, Option A was however the preferred option with affordable housing of a policy equivalent amount with the provision of 5No. 3bed units of social rent. These options were both agreed by the applicant and option A was preferred by members, however at the applicant's request, the application was decided without a S106 agreement to secure the affordable housing (reason 2 of the refusal).

6.6.2 The reduction of the height of the building has lost 5 units reducing the scheme from 37 to 32. In line with Council policy, we would expect 11 units (35%) affordable housing. The policy then requires the majority (85%) of those 11 units to be rented affordable housing (60% affordable rents and 20% social rents), then just 15% LCHO. That would result in 7No. affordable rent, 2No. social rent and 2 x shared ownership.

6.6.3 The application has offered 2 units of affordable housing (2no 3B5P duplex units). This is 6% of the development in unit numbers and 9.5% of the development in habitable rooms. This therefore fails to achieve 35% of the development on unit number or on habitable rooms. Furthermore both of the 2 units were initially proposed as shared ownership with no social or affordable rented housing. This is below the targets sought by policy and as such the viability of the scheme must be considered.

6.6.4 The applicant has submitted a viability assessment for the development which has been review by consultants (BNP Paribas) appointed by the Council. This has concluded that the development can feasible provide either 6 units of shared ownership or 1 unit of social rent tenure (a 3 bed duplex).



6.6.5 In light of this, the applicant has agreed to provide the 2 affordable units as 1 social rent and 1 affordable rent. This is in excess of the minimum provision identified by the viability assessment and is supported by officers. Although the shared ownership tenure could have provided more units by number, the provision of 2 No 3 bed units of social and affordable rent is preferred to meet the most acute housing needs of the Borough.

6.7 (f) Transport, access and servicing

6.7.1 The site is located in an accessible location. The location is suited for new development in accordance with policy T2 of the Location of New Development. As supported by the Transport Assessment and response for the Highways Authority, there are no concerns or objections to the development in highway terms.

6.7.2 The development would see the replacement of two site entrances with the provision of one access/egress point. Swept Path analysis demonstrates that cars from all parking spaces, as well as a refuse lorry, will be able to turn within the site allowing for vehicles to always enter and leave in forward gear.

6.7.3 Hertfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority has raised no objection to the development subject to recommended conditions and s106 agreement for a travel plan statement. Some of the conditions recommended have not been included as the content of these is in duplication of details already submitted and agreed, duplicate other controls (for example under the highways act), or do not meet the relevant tests for conditions

6.8 (g) Car and cycle parking

6.8.1 The development proposes 32 car spaces to serve the 32 units (1 per flat). This has been increased from the initial proposal of 30 spaces for 43 units (0.69 spaces per flat) and the previously refused scheme of 33 car spaces to 37 flats (0.89 per flat).

6.8.2 The site is identified within zone 4 of the Car and Cycle Parking Standards Map of the Watford District Plan 2000. Appendix 2 of the Watford District Plan sets maximum standards for car parking provision based on the identified zone. In accordance with these standards, the development of 32 units should not have more than 47.5 car spaces. The proposed 32 spaces is within that maximum standard and is compliant with 'saved' policy T22 of the Watford District Plan 2000.

6.8.3 'Saved' policy T22 sets parking standards as a maximum to restrict over

provision, over capacity and to encourage the use of alternative transport modes to assist in reduction of traffic and congestion. This is however applied alongside 'saved' policy T24 which states that "significantly lower levels of parking provision may be acceptable where demand for parking is likely to be less and any tendency for overspill on street is or can be controlled."

- 6.8.4 The application site is not within a controlled parking zone (CPZ) and so residents of the development cannot be excluded from on road parking, however the site does meet the criteria of 'saved' policy T24 to support lower parking provision. Specifically, the site is 2km from the town centre, it is 1km from Bushey Train Station and has bus stops 110m and 120m away on the main bus route on Eastbury Road.
- 6.8.5 Other support for non-car use for the development is provided by the provision of secure cycle parking for the development pursuant to 'saved' policy T10. The conditions and s106 agreement of the application also secure a Travel Plan Statement and required contributions to facilitate non-car travel options for future residents.
- 6.8.6 This provision of parking lower than the maximum standards is further supported by the Transport Assessment submitted with the application (dated July 2018, prepared by EAS, Ref 1519/2018 Final 2). Sections 4.10 to 4.20 of the report consider the local evidence for parking needs appropriate to the development. This identifies that in this character area, the 2011 Census revealed car ownership as 0.55 per flat household. The provision of 1 space per flat is therefore in excess of the expected need and is supported. It is noted that the provision has been increased following the previous application although that application was not refused on parking or highway grounds.
- 6.8.7 It is therefore again considered that the development would achieve the right balance of providing sufficient on site parking whilst not providing excessive parking that would worsen traffic and congestion in the area. It is therefore considered that the car parking provision of the development is fully compliant with the standards and objectives of 'saved' policies T22 and T24.

## 7. Consultation responses received

### 7.1 Statutory consultees and other organisations

Name of Statutory Consultee / Other Organisation	Comment	Officer Response
HCC Lead Local Flood	Surface Water Drainage	Noted and conditions

Authority	scheme supported. No objection. Conditions recommended	added.
HCC Local Highway Authority	No objections subject to conditions and S106 to secure Travel Plan and Contributions. Suggestion also to create a new CPZ for the area and exempt development from this.	Noted. Travel Plan set by condition and s106. Other conditions recommended are however deemed to be in duplication of details already submitted and acceptable or requesting details that are no relevant to planning and covered by Highways
HCC waste and minerals	Waste Matters are a material planning consideration.	Waste matters considered as part of the application.
HCC Property services	CIL relevant	Noted.
Herts Ecology	No significant ecological constraints on the site. No objections.	Noted
Herts Constabulary Crime Prevention Design Service	Support of crime prevention and secure by design recognition in the scheme.	Noted
HCC Fire and rescue service	Fire Hydrants to be secured by s106	Noted and included in S106 heads of terms.

## 7.2 Internal Consultees

<b>Name of Internal Consultee</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
Planning Policy WBC	Awaiting comments.	Any comments will be provided in update sheet however case officer notes policy and design support for the previous scheme which is unlikely to have changed.
Head of Housing WBC	Initial comments- The scheme provides 2 units of Shared ownership with no rental units. On the basis	Following viability assessment and negotiation the AH provision has been

	off an unacceptable tenure mix and too few units, the Housing Service does not support this application.	bettered to 2No. 3 bed units with 1 social rent and 1 affordable rent. Awaiting final housing comments.
Waste & Recycling Team, WBC	Bin allocation requirements provided.	Bin storage is provided. Swept path analysis shows that refuse vehicles can turn within the site and so can enter and leave in forward gear.
Arboricultural Officer, WBC	No objection subject to tree replacement and tree protection measures.	Conditions included.
Economic development	Response with no comments to make	Noted

### 7.3 Representations received from interested parties

48 letters of objection have been received

<b>Objection comment</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>
The development is too tall. Its scale, design and bulk is out of keeping with the area.	The development of part 3 and part 4 storeys was refused due to its 'height, scale and massing'. By virtue of the loss of the top floor the 3 storey building with a flat roof would be of a height approximately level with the two storey pitched roof of neighbouring buildings. The height reduction has also reduced the mass and overall scale of the building. The massing is further broken up visually by the articulation of the building. This reason for refusal has therefore been overcome.
The revised scheme has not overcome the harm that would occur to neighbouring properties.	The original scheme was not refused on grounds of impact to neighbours. Both the original and this revised scheme are fully compliant with policy and guidance and the impact to neighbours is not deemed as harmful.
Only two affordable homes are provided	As a result of the loss of the top floor, the development has lost 5 dwellings. The applicant has asserted that the scheme

	can therefore no longer provide the policy required amount of affordable housing and a reduced provision has been proposed.
The development provides insufficient parking and fails to meet the standards of the Watford District Plan 2000.	The original development with a 33 spaces for 37 was not refused on grounds on inadequate parking. This was therefore deemed as appropriate. The revised scheme has nonetheless increased the proportion to 32 spaces for 32 flats. This remains acceptable and in accordance with maximum standards.
Existing problems of inconsiderate on road parking making it difficult for people to access their drives. Particularly bad on match days.	This is an existing situation and outside planning control. As set out in the report it is considered that the development would achieve the right balance of providing sufficient on site parking whilst not providing excessive parking that would worsen traffic and congestion in the area.
Objection to the loss of the pub which is a community asset.	The retention of the pub is not required in policy terms. An application for the protection of the pub as a community asset was made however this was refused as not appropriate. The previous application was not refused on the grounds of the loss of the pub and this is considered to be acceptable.
Watford is overpopulated. Insufficient amenities- NHS/Schools/Trains.	National Government sets a presumption in favour of sustainable development and in particular emphasizes support for residential development. This objection cannot be considered as a material consideration against the application.
The development should include a coffee shop/café/restaurant for local residents	This preference is noted, but the Local Planning authority must consider the application before it.
Subsidence issues in Silk Mill Lane should be considered	This is a situation outside of the application site and outside of planning control or intervention.

## 8. Recommendation

That, pursuant to a planning obligation under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 having been completed to secure the following Heads of Terms, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions listed below:

#### Section 106 Heads of Terms

- i) To secure 2 No x 3 bed duplex units of the development to be Affordable Housing units comprising 1 no. social rented unit and 1 no. affordable rented unit.
- ii) To secure a review mechanism of the viability of the development to be undertaken towards the end of the project when actual build costs and sales values of the flats are known. This shall allow financial payment to be made towards affordable housing provision where the viability of the development can be shown to have improved to provide a financial surplus;
- iii) To secure a financial payment to Hertfordshire County Council of £2,000 for the long term monitoring of the proposed Travel Plan for the site;
- iv) To secure the provision of fire hydrants to serve the site as required by Hertfordshire County Council.

#### Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun within a period of 3 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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:-

Drawing number	Rev	Title
PL-001	-	Site Location Plan
PL-002	-	Demolition Plan
SK-180219-i	-	Existing Building Areas
TS17-358M\1	-	Topographical Survey
TS17-358M\2	-	Floor Plans 1 of 4
TS17-358M\3	-	Floor Plans 2 of 4

TS17-358M\4	-	Floor Plans 3 of 4
TS17-358M\5	-	Floor Plans 4 of 4
TS17-358M\6	-	Existing elevations
PL-16	G	Proposed site plan
PL-14	B	Proposed Basement Plan
PL-10	H	Proposed Ground Floor
PL-11	H	Proposed First Floor
PL-12	H	Proposed 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor
PL-13	H	Proposed Roof Plan
PL-20	D	Front elevation
PL-21	D	Rear elevation
PL-22	D	East elevation
PL-23	B	West elevation
LP/THHERWH/020 B	-	Landscaping Scheme

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

3. Development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by, the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed.

Reason - The development may lead to sewage flooding; to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community.

4. No external facing materials shall be installed on any building of the development until full details and samples of all the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31.

5. No dwelling shall be occupied until a detailed Travel Plan Statement for the has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning The Travel Plan Statement for the residential development shall consist of a written agreement with the County Council setting out a scheme to

encourage, regulate and promote green travel measures for residents, in accordance with the provisions of the County Council's 'Travel Plan Guidance for Business and Residential Development'. The approved Travel Plan Statement shall be implemented at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development encourages a wide range of sustainable travel choices to reduce the impact of travel and transport on the environment, in accordance with Policy T3 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31.

6. No part of the development shall be occupied until a detailed hard landscaping scheme for the site, including details of the roof gardens, hard standing, site boundary treatments, play area and external lighting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the site and the wider area, in accordance with Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31.

7. No part of the development shall be occupied until a detailed soft landscaping scheme for the site, including details of all trees to be lost and retained, all new replacement trees, details of the roof gardens and appropriate irrigation systems, and a landscape management and maintenance plan, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The detailed scheme shall be based upon the Landscape Proposals of the approved drawings. The approved soft landscaping scheme shall be carried out not later than the first available planting and seeding season after completion of development. Any trees or plants whether new or existing which within a period of five years die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, or in accordance with details approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the site and the wider area, in accordance with Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31.

8. No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and



minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.

9. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved SUDS Strategy carried out by EAS job number 1519 draft2 dated July 2018 and the following mitigation measures;
  1. Limiting the surface water run-off to a maximum of 5 l/s with discharge into the Thames Water sewer.
  2. 2. Providing attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.
  3. Undertake a drainage strategy to include the use oversized pipes, permeable paving, and a geo-cellular attenuation system.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.

10. The measures of the Arboricultural Method Statement of the Arboricultural Report February 2018 prepared by David Clarke, including *tree protection, 'no-dig' construction and ground protection shall be applied*. No materials, vehicles, fuel or any other ancillary items shall be stored or buildings erected inside the protection fencing; no changes in ground level may be made within the spread of any tree or shrubs (including hedges) without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the existing trees and shrubs (including hedges) which represent an important visual amenity during the period of construction works in accordance with Policy SE37 of the Watford District Plan 2000.

11. No part of the development shall be occupied until the modified proposed access and egress arrangements from Eastbury Road, as shown in principle on the approved drawings has been completed in full.

Reason: In the interests of the safe operation of the site and the surrounding highway, in accordance with saved Policies T21 and SE7 of the Watford District Plan 2000.

12. No dwelling within the development shall be occupied until the bin and bicycle storage has been provided for the use of residents, in accordance with the approved drawings. These facilities shall be retained at all times for the use of the residential occupiers of the dwellings.

Reason: To ensure that adequate facilities exist for the future occupiers of the dwellings, in accordance with saved Policies T10 and SE7 of the Watford District Plan 2000, Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31 and the Residential Design Guide 2016.

13. No dwelling shall be occupied until details of a communal terrestrial television aerial(s) and satellite dish(es) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the building, in accordance with Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31.

14. No dwelling shall be occupied until the details of car parking allocation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reasons: To ensure a suitable allocation of car parking spaces to the units.

15. For the avoidance of doubt, no communications development permitted by Class B or Class C of Part 16 of Schedule 2 of the Town and

Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 shall be undertaken on the building.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the building, in accordance with Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31.

### **Informatives**

IN912 Hours of Construction

IN913 Community Infrastructure Levy Liability

IN914 Section 106 Undertaking

IN909 Street naming and Numbering

IN907 Consideration of proposal in a positive and proactive manner

IN915 Highway Works – HCC agreement required