

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**BALDOCK & DISTRICT COMMITTEE
(Baldock, Arbury and Weston and Sandon Wards)**

**Meeting held at The Community Centre, Simpson Drive, Baldock
on 12 December 2005 at 7.30 p.m.**

PRESENT: *Councillors I.J. Knighton (Chairman), M.E. Weeks (Vice-Chairman), S.K. Jarvis, Marilyn Kirkland, and M.R.M. Muir.*

IN ATTENDANCE: *Head of Community Development & Cultural Services, Head of Strategy & Support Services, Head of Financial Services, Projects Manager (Planning Policy), Principal Planning Officer, Area Planning Officer, Community Development Officer (Baldock Area and Youth) and Committee & Member Services Officer.*

ALSO PRESENT: *Michael Moralee (Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Baldock Area, Hertfordshire Highways).*

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Marilyn Kirkland to her first Baldock & District Committee meeting since her election as the new Councillor for Baldock East Ward.

The Chairman informed the Committee that, due to the number of members of the public present, planning applications would be brought forward to be considered first, before the other Items on the Agenda were considered in order.

66. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A.D. Young.

Apologies were also received from Station Officer McKenzie of Hertfordshire Fire Service, who was unable to attend the Committee meeting due to an explosion at a fuel storage site in Hemel Hempstead on 11 December 2005. Station Officer McKenzie stated that he hoped to attend the meeting of the Committee to be held on 23 January 2006.

Councillor M.E. Weeks apologised to the Committee when he had to leave at 9.42 p.m. due to difficulties with his babysitter.

67. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2005 be approved as a true record of the proceedings and signed by the Chairman.

68. NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was submitted for consideration by the Committee.

69. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor I.J. Knighton declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 7 – Implementation Plans for the Museums and Galleries Best Value Fundamental Service Review – as he had been the Lead Member for this review, in his role as the Portfolio Holder for Leisure & E-Government. Councillor Knighton reserved his right to speak and vote in this matter.

Councillor Marilyn Kirkland declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 14 – Champion News – as she was a member of the Baldock Festival Committee. Councillor Kirkland reserved her right to speak and vote in this matter.

Councillor I.J. Knighton declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 16 – Planning Applications: Knights Templar School, Park Lane, Baldock – as he had children who attended the school. Councillor Knighton reserved his right to speak and vote in this matter.

Councillor M.E. Weeks declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 16 – Planning Applications: Knights Templar School, Park Lane, Baldock – as he had children who attended the school. Councillor Weeks reserved his right to speak and vote in this matter.

Councillor I.J. Knighton declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 16 – Planning Applications: Streetlight 419 (and outside 29 Grosvenor Road), Royston Road, Baldock – as he had previously owned property in Grosvenor Road. Councillor Knighton informed the Committee that he no longer owned the property, and reserved his right to speak and vote in this matter.

70. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr Peter Chapman had given due notice that he wished to speak at the meeting regarding planning application reference 05/01420/1 – Knights Templar School, Park Street Baldock. Mr Chapman thanked the Committee for previously granting permission for the new artificial sports pitch, and informed them that the reason he had had to come back was that the Football Foundation, who were sponsors to allow community use of the facility, would not release the promised funding unless the operating hours were amended to fit their requirements. This involved an additional 30 minutes usage with floodlights between Monday to Friday (taking the time to 9.30 p.m.), and an extra two hours on Saturday and Sunday nights (taking the time to 6.30 p.m.).

Mr Jonathan Moore had given due notice that he wished to speak at the meeting regarding planning application reference 05/01557/1TD – Streetlight 419 (and outside 29 Grosvenor Road), Royston Road, Baldock. Mr Moore made reference to the previous applications which had been refused by Committee and stated that the only differences to the application were another increase in the height of the proposed mast (from 10m to 12.4m), and the movement of the equipment cabinets onto the residential side of the site.

With regard to the new application, additional information regarding the search for alternative sites was included, as previously requested by the Committee. However, Mr Moore stated that this information was not comprehensive enough to provide justification for permitting the development, especially as many of the sites investigated were never seen as feasible to start with, or were dismissed as options with little or no evidence to support the dismissals.

Mr Moore also stressed to the Committee that the movement of the supporting equipment to the Grosvenor Road side of the proposed site, thus moving it from the A505 to a residential location, was totally inappropriate as it would severely impact on the street scene and visual amenity of the road.

The Chairman thanked Mr Chapman and Mr Moore for addressing the Committee and stated that their views would be considered when determining the applications.

71. FIRE SERVICE UPDATE

The Chairman informed the Committee that, due to the explosion and resulting fire at a fuel storage site in Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire on 11 December 2005, Station Officer McKenzie had sent his apologies as he would be unable to attend the Committee meeting.

The Chairman stated that Station Officer McKenzie would instead attend the meeting of the Committee to be held on 23 January 2006.

72. IMPLEMENTATION PLANS OF THE MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES BEST VALUE FUNDAMENTAL SERVICE REVIEW

The Head of Strategy & Support Services presented her report to the Committee, which provided Members with an understanding of the proposals for developing and managing the implementation plans for the key outcomes of the Best Value Fundamental Service Review of the Museums and Galleries Service. The Committee was asked to make further suggestions of how to ensure that their local communities could be fully engaged in planning the new facilities proposed.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Head of Strategy & Support Services stated that, whilst current use of museums by residents of the District was low, those using the service had a high level of customer satisfaction and, following a consultation exercise conducted as part of the review, it was clear that even those residents who had not attended a museum were very supportive of the continued provision of cultural and heritage opportunities offered by the museums service. She stressed that the service was not limited just to the two museums run directly (in Letchworth Garden City and Hitchin), but there were a lot of collections that were loaned out (for example to schools), and the service also played an important role in supporting voluntary-run museums, such as those in Baldock and Ashwell.

The Committee expressed their support for the work that the service did, and stressed that the Baldock Museum facility needed to be reviewed quite urgently as part of this process, and the current facilities were not adequate for providing access to the public to the artifacts and other items which illustrated the history of the town and surrounding area. Particular reference was made to the number of Roman artifacts that were frequently found in Baldock, and those items discovered during the construction of the Baldock Bypass, which could not be shared with the community due to lack of resource in the town.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Head of Strategy & Support Services be noted;
- (2) That the following comments and suggestions made by the Committee on the proposed plans be provided to the Head of Strategy & Support Services for consideration when formulating and recommending proposals to Cabinet:
 - That the partnership working approach taken during this review to ensure better engagement with all communities in the District be supported;
 - That appropriate collaboration between those conducting this review and other officers working on projects such as developing the Town Centre Strategy, to ensure appropriate, non-duplicated provision for the benefit of the community be supported.
- (3) That the need for improved facilities for Baldock Museum to allow full use of and access to the large range of artifacts related to the town's history by the public, as well as other exhibits of interest from throughout the District, be explored by officers.

REASONS FOR DECISIONS:

- (1) Cabinet asked that all Area Committees be consulted in formulating and recommending proposals.
- (2) Area Committees with their strong local community links were ideal placed to sign post people to the Forum.
- (3) To allow Members to use their local knowledge of local consultation opportunities and events, which could be included in the Consultation Plans for this project.

73. SERVICE AND FINANCIAL PLANNING – SAVINGS & GROWTH 2006/2007 TO 2010/2011

The Head of Financial Services presented a report of the Strategic Director of Financial & Regulatory Services to the Committee, which sought the Committee's views on the provisional savings and growth items as part of the consultation process on Service and Financial Planning for 2006/2007 onwards.

The report of the Strategic Director of Financial and Regulatory Services included the following appendices:

- a) Appendix 1 – Savings – Hertfordshire County Council subsidies
- b) Appendix 2 – Budget forecast over the next 5 years
- c) Appendix 3 – Savings – Service options
- d) Appendix 4 – Savings – Income increase options
- e) Appendix 5 – Growth – Revenue options
- f) Appendix 6 – Growth – Capital options
- g) Appendix 7 – Cabinet decisions 15 November 2005

In response to questions from the Committee about the number of Information Technology projects that were listed for growth items, the Head of Financial Services stated that, as well as having already gone through rigorous business analysis tests, all Information Technology projects were being recommended to Cabinet for capital funding approval only, which would require all projects to be self-funding for revenue through cash and non-cash savings.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Strategic Director of Financial & Regulatory Services be noted;
- (2) That the following comments made by the Committee be considered when formulating the draft Budget for approval by Cabinet in December 2005:
 - The Committee welcomed the figures demonstrating cost of service per resident, but felt that more comparison with other Councils would provide a clearer picture of Council expenditure.
 - Savings Proposal CS4 – the Committee felt that, rather than immediate withdrawal of funding which helped provide an essential service to some residents of the District, it would be better to enter into discussions with Hertfordshire County Council and the bus service providers to facilitate better use of monies provided, to the benefit of residents.
 - Savings Proposal CS1 – the Committee noted that NHDC was the only remaining partner in the Highways funding partnership. As none of the other authorities in Hertfordshire appeared to have suffered a detrimental effect on the quality of their roads, the Committee asked that the value of continued funding provision be investigated, and funding withdrawn should no notable benefit be apparent.
 - Savings Proposals SP9 to SP11 – the Committee felt that withdrawal of these services would not be an acceptable option, as existing problems with lack of provision for youth would be increased.
 - Savings Proposal SP14 – as with savings proposal CS4, the Committee felt that immediate removal of the Dial-a-Ride scheme could have a negative impact on vulnerable members of the community. They therefore stated that it would be better to determine alternative provision before withdrawing the service.
 - Savings Proposal SP13 – the Committee noted that the provision of “Meals on Wheels” was a County Council function, not a District Council one, and supported the proposal to withdraw this funding.
 - Savings Proposal SP19 – the Committee stated that, with the existing small size of dog waste bins provided, reducing the frequency of collection was not feasible, especially in the summer months. It was therefore suggested that the cost of replacing the smaller bins with larger

ones be investigated, and compared with the perceived cost reduction in collection reduction to determine the value of the exercise.

- Savings Proposal SP21 – the Committee were strongly opposed to the closure of the Letchworth Garden City outdoor swimming pool, which was felt to provide a valuable facility for local residents in the Committee's area, not just in Letchworth Garden City. However, the Committee supported an investigation into ways that the pool could become more economically viable and provide a better service.
- The Committee asked whether the Government had been, or could be, approached for the provision of funding toward the cost of all-out elections in 2007, which would be required following the recent Boundary Review.
- The Committee expressed disappointment that no provision had been made for the provision of a Town Centre Manager for Baldock, following the recent establishment of a Town Centre Partnership. Baldock was the only town in the District without a Town Centre Manager, either on a part-time or full-time basis, and it was requested that consideration of such provision be made.

REASON FOR DECISION: To ensure that all Members were consulted on the proposed savings and growth bids and afforded the opportunity to comment before Cabinet set the draft Budget in December 2005.

74. **BALDOCK TOWN CENTRE STRATEGY – REVISED DRAFT**

The Projects Manager (Planning Policy) presented a report of the Head of Planning and Building Control, which sought Members agreement to the Baldock Town Centre Strategy Revised Draft, and to a draft Action Plan to support the policies in the revised Strategy.

The report of the Head of Planning and Building Control included the following appendices:

- a) Appendix A – Baldock Town Centre Strategy Revised Draft - December 2005
- b) Appendix B – Summary of comments to Baldock Town Centre Strategy Consultation Draft – September 2005
- c) Baldock Town Centre Strategy Draft Action Plan – December 2005.

The Projects Manager (Planning Policy) stressed to the Committee that the Strategy is a document designed to provide an overall framework to guide development and enhancement opportunities within the town. Some more specific information had been included in the Strategy following the consultation with stakeholder groups and the general public, such as the suggestion of a feasibility study for the continued community use of Baldock Town Hall.

The Committee stated that the issue of Baldock Town Hall was a principal concern for the residents of Baldock, and welcomed the proposal to have an independent investigation into its future. They also stated that, whilst there was a £2 million provision in the Council's capital programme for the enhancement and development of Baldock Town Centre, this amount would clearly be insufficient even for the minimum amount of work proposed under the Town Centre Strategy.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control be noted;
- (2) That the Baldock Town Centre Strategy Revised Draft as set out at Appendix A to the report be endorsed;
- (3) That the draft Action Plan as set out at Appendix C to the report be endorsed;

- (4) That the draft Action Plan be reviewed at meetings of the Committee, at least three times per year as the works progress;
- (5) That the draft Brief for consultants to undertake a feasibility study for the Baldock Town Hall be brought to a future meeting of the Committee for further input

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET:

- (1) That the Baldock Town Centre Strategy Revised Draft as set out at Appendix A to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control be endorsed and recommended to Full Council for adoption as the Council's Statement of Policy;
- (2) That the draft Action Plan as set out at Appendix C to the report be included as a separate appendix to the final adopted version of the Baldock Town Centre Strategy;
- (3) That the provision of additional capital funding for the enhancement of Baldock town centre be approved.

REASON FOR DECISIONS: To enable the Council to adopt a Strategy following 'public' involvement that provided an overall framework for guiding development and enhancement opportunities within the town centre over the next 10 years, and in doing so, contributed towards achieving the Council's strategic objectives.

75. DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: VEHICLE PARKING AT NEW DEVELOPMENT AND ASSOCIATED SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The Projects Manager (Planning Policy) presented a report of the Head of Planning and Building Control which sought the views of the Area Committee on the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Vehicle Parking Provision at New Development as part of the formal six-week consultation period. This report had been referred to Area Committees by Cabinet.

The draft SPD on Vehicle Parking at New Development had been circulated under separate cover to all members of the Committee, and was available on request for all other parties. The associated Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) had been provided for information in the Members' Room at the Council Offices, and copies of all three documents were available via the Council's website.

The Projects Manager (Planning Policy) stated that the Committee could provide any further comments in writing to the Planning Policy department, or by e-mail to planning.policy@north-herts.gov.uk by 6 January 2006.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control be noted;
- (2) That officers be requested to ensure District input into the Scrutiny review by Hertfordshire County Council into the provision of cross-overs, allowing people to park their vehicles within their own property and reducing the number of vehicles parking on the roads.

REASONS FOR DECISIONS:

- (1) There was a need for the Council to adopt guidance on vehicle parking at new development. To do this the Council would need to adopt a new SPD in line with national policy.
- (2) A draft version of the SPD had been made available for public consultation. The Area Committee views formed part of this consultation. In addition the draft SPD had to be the subject of draft SA and SEA, which had also been issued for public consultation.

76. INTEGRATED WORKS PROGRAMME 2006/2007 AND FORWARD WORKS PROGRAMME 2007 – 2011

The Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Baldock Area (Hertfordshire Highways) presented a report of the Principal Strategy Development Manager (Hertfordshire Highways) to the Committee. The report had been referred to Area Committees by the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint Member Panel at its meeting held on 17 October 2005, and sought the Committee's comments on the proposed Integrated Works Programme (IWP) for 2006/2007, and the Forward Works Programme (FWP) for 2007-2011. These comments would constitute the formal feedback of the Joint Member Panel to the County Council's Transport Panel as part of the development of the IWP and FWP.

The Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Baldock Area (Hertfordshire Highways) drew the Committee's attention to the two Plans, which were set out at Appendix A to the report. With regard to the Forward Works Programme however, the Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Baldock Area (Hertfordshire Highways) stressed that the items listed were of a less definite nature than those for the Integrated Works Programme for 2006/2007.

The Committee expressed their concern that there were several items listed which in the Programmes which gave only street names, not town names, which caused confusion as many towns had roads of the same name. The Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Baldock Area (Hertfordshire Highways) acknowledged this problem, and stated that he would inform the department that produced the Programmes, to prevent this problem occurring in future years.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Principal Strategy Development Manager (Hertfordshire Highways) be noted;
- (2) That the following comments and suggestions made by the Committee be passed to the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint Member Panel for incorporation into its formal feedback to the County Council's Transport Panel:
 - With regard to the Local Drainage Schemes posed on page 1 of the Integrated Works Programme 2006-2007 (North Herts Index), there was no reference to the fourth aspect of the drainage scheme as had been on the Programme for several years, which related to Icknield Way, Baldock, in the vicinity of Eagle Court.
 - With regard to the Integrated Transport Programme, Baldock Bypass, the Committee stressed that the enhancement works would not be limited to the town centre, but would be applied throughout the Committee's area.
 - With regard to the Accident Reduction works listed, concern was expressed by the Committee that no follow-up review appeared to be conducted once works had taken place. Particular reference was made to the recent works that had been carried out on the A507 which, whilst having some impact on the number of accidents, had not solved the problems entirely.

REASON FOR DECISIONS: The Committee was asked to use their local knowledge feedback any comments, either general or specific, on the composition and content of the IWP and FWP lists. All comments and responses would be passed onto the next meeting of the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint Member Panel and HCC's Highways and Transport Panel early in January 2006.

77. DRAFT ENHANCED HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME

The Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Baldock Area (Hertfordshire Highways) presented a report of the Principal Strategy Development Manager which informed the Committee of the progress made on the current review of the Highway Maintenance Strategy. This report had also been referred to the Committee by the

North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint Member Panel at its meeting on 17 October 2005.

The Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Baldock Area (Hertfordshire Highways) drew the Committee's attention to Appendix A to the report, which comprised the first draft of the North Herts Area Enhanced Maintenance Potential Programme List.

The Committee asked the Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Baldock Area (Hertfordshire Highways) to provide confirmation of the weight given to the traffic volumes on unclassified roads when deciding on maintenance priorities. They expressed concern that, by applying priorities simply by classification of the road, unclassified roads in the District which were heavily used would not receive the attention required.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Principal Strategy Development Manager (Hertfordshire Highways) be noted;
- (2) That the information requested by the Committee be provided in writing by the Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Baldock Area (Hertfordshire Highways) as soon as possible.

REASONS FOR DECISIONS:

- (1) To secure the involvement of local Members in the development of the Highway Maintenance Strategy Review;
- (2) To ensure that local Members' views formed part of the formal consultation process for the Review and that those views were brought to the attention of the Hertfordshire County Council Transport Panel.

78. AREA GOVERNANCE

The Head of Community Development & Cultural Services presented a report to the Committee which set out an Action Plan in respect of the improvements that were proposed for the Council's approach to Area Governance and improved community engagement.

The report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services included the following appendices:

- a) Appendix 1 – Area Governance Action Plan – November 2005
- b) Appendix 2 – Possible Additional Delegation to Area Committees
- c) Appendix 3 – Guidance Notes for Area Chairmen
- d) Appendix 4 – Standing Orders for Area Committees.

The Head of Community Development & Cultural Services informed the Committee that the Actions set out in sections A and B of the appendices were either already in place, or in the process of being implemented. It was also stressed that no formal recommendation could be made with regard to the future planning application determination process until a formal response had been received from the Audit Review on Planning Delivery.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services be noted;
- (2) That the actions set out in Sections A and B of Appendix 1 to the report be approved;

- (3) That the actions set out in Section C of Appendix 1 to the report be approved, with the exception of numbers 48, 49 and 54, which would be considered further within the Service and Financial Planning process;
- (4) That further work to improve the relationship between Area Committees and the Local Strategic Partnership be carried out by officers, to keep the Partnership informed of work to cultivate community engagement.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET:

- (1) That, with regard to Actions 48 and 49 set out in Section C of Appendix 1 to the report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services, the proposals to reduce the cost of democracy be supported provided there was no impact on the service provided;
- (2) That, with regard to Action 54 set out in Section C of Appendix 1 to the report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services, the Committee continues to support the retention of the determination of planning applications at Area Committee level.

REASON FOR DECISIONS: To ensure effective implementation of Area Governance.

79. CHAMPION NEWS

The Community Development Officer for Baldock presented a report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services to the Committee, which advised them of the activities undertaken by the Community Development Officer for Baldock since the meeting of the Committee held on 7 November 2005, and brought to their attention some important community based activities that would be taking place during the next few months.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Head of Community Development be noted;
- (2) That the actions taken by the Community Development Officer for Baldock to promote greater community capacity and well-being for Baldock communities be endorsed.

REASON FOR DECISION: To keep members of the Committee apprised of the latest developments in community activities in Baldock.

80. ANNUAL GRANTS AND DEVELOPMENT DISCRETIONARY BUDGET 2004/05

The Community Development Officer for Baldock presented a report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services to the Committee, which set out the budgetary situation for the Committee, together with 3 additional requests for financial aid that had been received.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the current expenditure and balance of the Development Budget, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services, be noted;
- (2) That, subject to the securement of the remaining funds required, the sum of £1,205 be allocated from the Baldock Town Ward Development Budget to assist with phase 2 of the pollarding works on trees in Nightingale Way and Willian Way, Baldock;
- (3) That the remaining sum of £190 in the Committee's Small Area Grants Development Budget be awarded to the Baldock Town Twinning Association as a one-off payment to support the work of the group.

REASONS FOR DECISION:

- (1) The report was intended to apprise Members of the financial resources available to this Committee. It drew attention to the current budgetary situation, assisted in the effective financial management of the Committee's budget and ensured actions were performed within the Authority's Financial Regulations and the guidance contained in the Grants procedure;
- (2) The awarding of financial assistance to voluntary organisations and the use of discretionary spending allows the Committee to further the aims and strategic priorities of the Council.

81. GRANT APPLICATION – U13's BALDOCK / EISENBERG YOUTH FOOTBALL EXCHANGE

RESOLVED: That the sum of £552 be awarded to the U13's Baldock / Eisenberg Youth Football Exchange as a financial contribution to support the group's return visit to Eisenberg in April 2006, such monies to split as follows:

Baldock Town Ward Budget:	£420	(76%)
Baldock East Ward Budget:	£132	(24%)

REASON FOR DECISION: The awarding of financial assistance to voluntary organisations and the use of discretionary spending allows the Committee to further the aims and strategic priorities of the Council.

82. GRANT APPLICATION – HERTS YOUNG HOMELESS GROUP

The Head of Community Development and Cultural Services presented the grant application from the Herts Young Homeless Group to the Committee. He explained that, whilst the Group received a small amount of funding from the Council each year under a Service Level Agreement, they were experiencing financial difficulties whilst waiting for additional external funding.

The Committee expressed their support for the work that the Herts Young Homeless Group did within the local community, but stated that providing additional financial assistance to a group which already received support because they were in financial difficulties would set a dangerous precedence. It was also stated that the Committee's discretionary and development budgets were not the appropriate resource from which any such support should be taken.

RESOLVED: That no additional financial support be given to the Herts Young Homeless Group

REASON FOR DECISION: The awarding of financial assistance to voluntary organisations and the use of discretionary spending allows the Committee to further the aims and strategic priorities of the Council.

83. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee heard an oral representation from Mr Peter Chapman, Head Teacher of Knights Templar School, with regard to planning application reference 05/01420/1, which sought a variation in hours of operation of the new artificial sports pitch at the school.

The Committee also heard an oral representation from Mr Jonathan Moore with regard to planning application reference 05/01557/1TD, which sought permission to erect a 12.4 m high dual-purpose telecommunications lamppost and associated equipment in place of Streetlight 419 on Royston Road, Baldock. This development would also be located outside 29 Grosvenor Road, Baldock.

Details of these representations are outlined at Minute 70 above.

RESOLVED: To determine the applications as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control as submitted to the Committee in the following schedule:

SCHEDULE

Reference Number	Description of Development and location	Decision
05/01420/1	Knights Templar School, Park Street, Baldock Variation of hours of operation condition to allow use until 9.30 p.m. Monday to Friday and 6.30 p.m. Saturday and Sunday (as variation of condition 3 of planning permission 05/00137/1 granted 07/07/05).	GRANTED (as per report)
05/01557/1TD	Streetlight 419 (and outside 29 Grosvenor Road), Royston Road, Baldock Erection of replacement 12.4m high dual-purpose telecommunications lamppost with integrated antennas, two radio equipment cabinets and ancillary development.	REFUSED (see (a) below)

(a) **RESOLVED:** That with regard to planning application reference 05/01557/1TD, planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

- (1) The proposed replacement street lamp, incorporating telecommunication apparatus and associated equipment cabinets and retaining wall, by virtue of their height, massing, overall appearance and loss of greensward and vegetation around the junction of Grosvenor Road and Royston Road, would represent incongruous and alien features in the street scene to the severe detriment of the visual amenities and overall environmental quality of this predominantly residential area of Baldock, contrary to the provisions of Policy 48 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No. 2 with Alterations and the advice contained within PPG8 – Telecommunications.

84. PLANNING APPEALS

The Area Planning Officer informed the Committee that the following planning appeals had been lodged since the meeting of the Committee held on 7 November 2005:

Appellant	Mr & Mrs Bail
Reference number	05/00499/1HH
Address	5 The Tene, Baldock
Proposal	Two storey front extension
Method	Written representations

The Area Planning Officer informed the Committee that the following appeals had been determined since the meeting of the Committee held on 7 November 2005:

Appellant	Mr Huffer
Reference number	04/01974/1
Address	57 Ashwell Road, Bygrave
Proposal	Cattery

Decision

Appeal DISMISSED on Green Belt grounds.

The meeting closed at 10.41 p.m.

....

.....

Chairman