

**NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**MEETING HELD VIRTUALLY ON THURSDAY, 28TH MAY, 2020 AT 7.30 PM**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** *Councillors: Terry Tyler (Chair), Daniel Allen (Vice-Chair), Ruth Brown, Val Bryant, Morgan Derbyshire, Mike Hughson, Tony Hunter, David Levett, Ian Mantle, Ian Moody, Sue Ngwala, Sean Prendergast, Mike Rice and Michael Weeks*

**In Attendance:** *Simon Ellis (Development and Conservation Manager), Nurainatta Katevu (Legal Advisor), Tom Rea (Principal Planning Officer), Richard Tiffin (Principal Planning Officer), Melanie Stimpson (Democratic Services Manager), Hilary Dineen (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager), Mark Robinson (IT Network & Infrastructure Manager), Vic Godfrey (IT Manager) and Matthew Hepburn (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer)*

**Also Present:** *At the commencement of the meeting approximately 5 members of the public, including registered speakers.*

**99 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**

*Audio Recording – 27 Seconds*

The Chair welcomed everyone to this virtual Planning Control Committee meeting that was being conducted with Members and Officers at various locations, communicating via audio/video and online and advised that there was the opportunity for the public and press to listen and view proceedings.

The Chair invited the Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer to explain how proceedings would work.

The Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer advised the following:

Attendance

A roll call was undertaken to confirm that the required Members, Officers and Registered Speakers were present and could hear and be heard.

If for any reason the meeting was not quorate an Officer interject the meeting and the meeting would adjourn immediately. Once the meeting was quorate the meeting would resume.

Only Members present during the entire debate for an item were entitled to vote. If a Member had been cut off during the debate and re-joined the meeting, then they would not be able to vote on that item.

Live Streaming

The meeting was being streamed live on the Council's YouTube channel. If live streaming failed the meeting would adjourn. If the live stream could not be restored within a reasonable

period then the remaining business would be considered at a time and date fixed by the Chair. If the Chair did not fix a date, the remaining business would be considered at the next ordinary meeting.

If technology failed for a member of the public who had attended to exercise their right to speak and was unable to do so, the Chair may decide to proceed to the next item of business to allow for connection to be re-established. If connection could not be restored within a reasonable period, the Chair may decide to conclude the remaining business, or consider the remaining business at a time and date fixed by the Chair. If the Chair did not fix a date, the remaining business would be considered at the next ordinary meeting.

#### Noise Interference

The Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer asked all in attendance to ensure that electronic devices were muted.

#### Rules of Debate

If a Member wished to speak they should use the raise hand button and this would alert the host that they wished to speak. The host would inform the Chair of the names of the speakers, who should wait to be invited by the Chair to address the Planning Control Committee.

Members were reminded that the normal procedure rules in respect of debate and times to speak would apply.

If Officers needed to address the Planning Control Committee at any point during proceedings, they were requested to respectfully interject and await a response before addressing the Chair.

#### Voting

When satisfied that there had been sufficient debate the Chair would request that the relevant Planning Officer read out the recommendation that Members would be voting upon.

There would be three elements to a vote. Members who wished to vote 'For' the recommendation would be invited to use the raise hand button first. Members who wished to vote 'Against' the recommendation would be invited to use the raise hand button second. Members who wished to 'Abstain' would be invited to use the raise hand button last.

The clerk would confirm the names of Members voting at each stage. However, details of how Members voted would not be kept or minuted unless a Recorded Vote was requested or an individual requests that their vote be recorded.

The Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer would clearly state the result of the vote and the Chair would proceed to the next agenda item.

In the event of a tied vote the Chair would have the casting vote.

The Chair, Councillor Terry Tyler, started the meeting proper.

## **100 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

*Audio Recording – 9 Minutes 11 Seconds*

There were no apologies for absence received from Councillors.

**101 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS**

*Audio Recording – 9 Minutes 25 Seconds*

There was no other business notified.

**102 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

*Audio Recording – 9 Minutes 27 Seconds*

- (1) The Chair welcomed those present at the meeting;
- (2) The Chair advised that, in accordance with Council Policy, the meeting would be audio recorded and live streamed on the Council's YouTube;
- (3) The Chair drew attention to the item on the agenda front pages regarding Declarations of Interest and reminded Members that, in line with the Code of Conduct, any Declarations of Interest needed to be declared immediately prior to the item in question;
- (4) The Chair clarified matters for the registered speakers and informed members of the public that they 5 minutes for each group of speakers i.e. 5 minutes for objectors and 5 minutes for supporters. The 5 minute time limit also applied to Member Advocates.

The bell would sound after 4 1/2 minutes as a warning and again at 5 minutes to signify that the speaker must cease.

- (5) The Chair advised that the Committee would take part in the 'Clap for Carers' and therefore there would be a pause in proceedings at 8pm.

**103 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

*Audio Recording – 11 Minutes 18 Seconds*

The Chair confirmed that the 5 registered speakers were present and that there were 2 Member Advocates.

**104 19/01172/HYA ANGLIAN BUSINESS PARK, ORCHARD ROAD, ROYSTON, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG8 5TW**

*Audio Recording – 11 Minutes 35 Seconds*

Hybrid application for the residential redevelopment of the Anglian Business Park to provide a total of up to 67 dwellings (of a range of sizes, types and tenures including affordable housing) and associated parking, landscaping, open space and ancillary works comprising: PHASE 1 - Application for full planning permission for the erection of two apartment blocks within the southern part of the site comprising a total of 28 units and associated parking, landscaping, open space and associated works; SUBSEQUENT PHASES - Application for outline planning permission on the remaining part of the site involving the demolition of the existing business park buildings and the provision of up to 39 dwellings including a mix of houses and apartments and associated parking, landscaping, open space and ancillary works (all matters reserved except for access).

The Principal Planning Officer informed Members of the Committee that there were some corrections to the report, as follows:

- Paragraph 4.3.13 – the first sentence should read “would be satisfactory” (“be” was missing)
- Paragraph 4.4.1 should be re-worded to read:  
  
‘That permission be granted in detail for phase 1 and in outline for phases 2 and 3. NOTE: Most conditions apply only to the detailed permission for 28 units (phase 1) Conditions will be identified as applying to either the ‘detailed’ or ‘outline’ permission. No designation identifies conditions as applying to both.’
- Condition 23 should cite ‘condition 22’ not condition 23.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report in respect of application 19/01172/HYA supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

Mr Kaine Rowley thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to planning application 19/01172/HYA, including:

- The primary concern centred around the increase traffic on Orchard Road during the phased build and after;
- During peak ‘non-Covid’ times, it already took 10-15 minutes to exit Orchard Grange onto Orchard Road owing to parked vehicles;
- Exiting onto Orchard Road was made more difficult as a result of poor visibility and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs);
- The addition of more HGVs during the construction work and more residential vehicles post construction work, would compound the already existing issue;
- Disruption could be caused to existing residents; and
- Noise from the proposed new play area could affect residents.

The following Members sought clarification from Mr Rowley’s presentation:

- Councillor Ruth Brown; and
- Councillor Michael Weeks.

In response to questions of clarification, Mr Rowley responded as follows:

- The issue with exiting the Orchard Grange estate was due to vehicles parked opposite on Charding Crescent and a high number of construction vehicles using the road;

In response to Members’ questions, the Principal Planning Officer responded as follows:

- Members were considering outlined and detailed planning permission – Phase 1 in detail and Phases 2 and 3 as a matter of principle up to 39 dwellings.

*NB: There was a pause in proceedings at 20:00 to carry out the ‘Clap for Carers’. The meeting resumed at 20:05.*

Following the pause in proceedings, the Principal Planning Officer continued to respond to questions raised, as follows:

- The site had been industrial for some years;
- The site had not been subject to planning permission for a residential development;
- An element of 2 blocks would be affordable housing;

- The term 'over developed' had no meaning unless precisely defined. Over developed could mean a multiple of things such as garden size being too small, not sufficient parking or the buildings being too big;
- The National Planning Policy Framework urged Authorities to make optimum efficient use of land; and
- This site was being developed at optimum capacity in his opinion.

The Chair thanked Mr Rowley for his presentation.

Mr Simon Hoskins, JB Planning Associates, thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in support of planning application 19/01172/HYA, including:

- The site had been allocated for residential development in the emerging Local Plan;
- The site was allocated as being one of only few sites available within Royston being suitable for residential development and occupying previously-developed land;
- The site was within a sustainable location, close to the railway station, shopping facilities and the town centre;
- The site was divided into two parts. The northern part comprised of four business units and the southern part comprised of vacant land, immediately available for development;
- In order to bring forward an early residential scheme, the application had been submitted as a hybrid;
- The proposed layout and design of the new flats had been carefully considered to achieve a high quality development. Two blocks were proposed in Phase 1, each containing 14 new flats;
- The scheme provided appropriate levels of car and cycle parking; and
- The S106 agreement provided for 30% of the new dwellings onsite to be affordable housing.

The following Members sought clarification from Mr Hoskin's presentation:

- Councillor Sue Ngwala;
- Councillor Daniel Allen;
- Councillor Tony Hunter; and
- Councillor Ruth Brown.

In response to questions raised by Members, Mr Hoskin responded as follows:

- All of the affordable units would be within the rented tenure;
- The site was previously used for farm manure, making it contaminated land;
- A detailed drainage scheme and a surface water assessment had been put together. The finer details of which were with the Lead Local Flood Authority – Hertfordshire County Council;
- There was provision for cycle parking – 40 for 28 units; and
- The applicant had no objection of the possibility of creating a pedestrian link between the application site and Braeburn Walk. However, there was a view that this would not provide any real benefit for the occupiers of either development.

The Chair thanked Mr Hoskins for his presentation.

In response to issues raised, the Principal Planning Officer provided the following information to Members:

- Play areas needed to be located where there was adequate surveillance. The proposed play area was in the correct place in his opinion; and

- Pedestrian access was not desirable in the area discussed by Members for security reasons and because the residents of the adjacent housing development might not want pedestrians walking between parked cars.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Ruth Brown;
- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Daniel Allen;
- Councillor Ian Mantle; and
- Councillor Tony Hunter.

Points raised during the debate by Members included:

- The lease of the existing units on the site;
- Noise concern;
- The number of parking spaces needed to be increased;
- Concern with changing industrial/employment land into residential; and
- Reducing the height and number of the blocks.

In response to points raised by Members during the debate, the Principal Planning Officer responded as follows:

- There were currently 4 industrial units on the site. The lease of units 1, 2 and 3 expired in 2028, with a break clause in 2023. The lease of unit 4 expired in 2024;
- Condition 11 dealt with noise mitigation measures. A Noise and Vibration Assessment needed to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority - the Council's Environmental Health Officers had been consulted and were satisfied;
- Members were directed to paragraph 4.3.9 on page 14 of the report in respect to a Member's question on density;
- Members were required to determine the application before them – a lesser scheme was not able to be assessed as it had not been looked into; and
- A Construction Traffic Management Plan was detailed at Condition 9.

It was proposed by Councillor Levett, seconded by Councillor Hunter and upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED:** That application 19/01172/HYA be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to completion of a satisfactory Section 106 agreement and the conditions and reasons contained in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager and the following amended and additional informatives:

Amended Condition 16:

To include additional sentence after the first sentence as follows: 'these details are also to include the specification of the proposed bin stores'

An additional informative to read:

Design of Subsequent Phases

It should be noted that the Council considers that the design of subsequent phases approved in outline must be predicated on the applicant's overall objective of 'greening the site'. Accordingly, the figure of 39 units is an upper quantum and should be regarded as subordinate to the aforementioned design objective.

**105 20/00603/FP 189 HIGH STREET, CODICOTE, HTICHIN, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG4 8UD**

*Audio Recording – 1 Hour 33 Minutes*

Erection of three 4-bed dwellings with associated parking, bin/cycle storage and alterations to existing vehicular access following demolition of existing dwelling.

Before the Development and Conservation Manager introduced the report, Councillor Ian Moody advised the Committee that he would be speaking as a Member Advocate on the item. He further added that he would not take part in the debate or vote and would disable his video and microphone on the completion of his presentation.

The Development and Conservation Manager presented the report in respect of application 20/00603/FP supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans and advised the following:

- Pre-commencement conditions had been agreed by the applicant;
- Condition 3 was missing from the report and would be added in; and
- Condition 10 was no longer required and would be replaced with a Contaminated Land Condition.

Mr Tom Brindley thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 20/00603/FP, including:

- While the proposal no longer attempted to incorporate Green Belt land, the impact on the Green Belt remained;
- The impact was exacerbated by the elevated height of the site. Plots 1 and 2 were significantly closer to the Green Belt boundary than the existing property and were significantly higher;
- Policy 57 of the Saved Local Plan required that 'housing proposals should relate to and enhance their site and surroundings, and the layout and design of the proposed dwellings/site will maintain and improve the character of the immediate context. This development would not maintain the character of the immediate context;
- Policy D1 stated the design must "Respond positively to the site's local context". This design is incongruous with the site's local context and that the Development must respond positively to the site taking into consideration position, orientation, scale, height, layout, massing. The height, layout and massing all failed this test;
- Parking was not available on site as the access road was too narrow. The density of the site also made manoeuvring cars difficult. The overall result would be a large number of car manoeuvres creating noise and pollution for both the residents of the site and the neighbouring houses; and
- The development would cause the loss of a substantial number of trees (11).

The following Members sought clarification from Mr Brindley's presentation:

- Councillor Michael Weeks; and
- Councillor Ruth Brown.

In response to questions raised by Members, Mr Brindley responded as follows:

- The peak of the ridge was located where the current building was and ran back almost green belt boundary and then fell away;
- The ridge sloped away in 3 sides;
- The current access served 187, 189 and 189a and this land was not owned by the developer; and

- There would be 2 access roads in parallel.

The Chair thanked Mr Brindley for his presentation.

Councillor Ian Moody, Member Advocate, thanked the Chair for the opportunity to speak in objection to application 20/00603/FP, including:

- The amended plans do not represent appropriate development for an edge of the 'built village' site, adjacent to the green belt;
- The site was clearly visible from the higher land to the east of the village;
- The existing dwellings were low level bungalows or chalet bungalows which sat on large plots making the area sparsely developed. The density of the proposal was in conflict with this and therefore is not sympathetic to the area;
- The height of the dwellings was still imposing and would have a significant detrimental impact on the surrounding properties;
- The proposed widening of the access would negatively impact adjacent properties, particularly the privacy of the residents of 191 High Street;
- There were concerns about an increase in traffic accessing onto the High Street in respect of safety and congestion; and
- This proposal rendered the green belt portion of the site inaccessible to pedestrians and vehicles.

The Chair thanked Councillor Moody for his presentation.

Councillor Moody disabled his Camera and Microphone and took no further part in the debate or vote on this item.

Aimee Cannon, WYG Group, thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in support of application 20/00603/FP, including:

- There were a number of benefits to the scheme over and above those that the previous scheme delivered;
- The scheme comprised a lower density development with a reduced number of family dwellings;
- The scheme was more spacious allowing for more landscaping opportunities, reduced hardstanding areas and enhanced ecology benefits;
- The proposal would result in an improved widened access with improved sightlines on to High Street;
- No objections had been received from technical officers;
- Objectors had raised the Green Belt as a concern- the revised application did not include any land within the Green Belt, thus there was no impact upon openness of the Green Belt;
- In relation to height, the application site was not subject to any restrictive covenants that stipulated any limit to the height and planning policy did not preclude against two storey dwellings providing residential amenity of neighbouring properties were maintained;
- The dwellings had been designed in close dialogue with Officers;
- The dwellings were at a higher elevation than the existing dwellings fronting High Street, however this needs to be read in context;
- The land did not sit within the planning application redline and as such access to the paddock should not be a material consideration; and
- The proposal was a small-scale housing development within a village identified for growth, on an under-utilised plot, and would provide additional housing contributing towards housing supply in North Herts.



The following Members sought clarification from Ms Cannon's presentation:

- Councillor Terry Tyler;
- Councillor Michael Weeks;
- Councillor Daniel Allen;
- Councillor David Levett; and
- Councillor Mike Hughson.

In response to questions raised by Members, Ms Cannon provided the following responses:

- The proposal would be visible from the green belt;
- Only the access road was owned by the applicant and would be widened by 4.1 metres; and
- Some low quality trees would be lost during the widening of the access road. However, these would be replaced as well as there being other landscaping opportunities.

*NB: There was a break in proceedings at 21:32. The meeting resumed at 21:40.*

In response to points and questions raised by Members, the Development and Conservation Manager responded as follows:

- It would be difficult to control a Right of Way; and
- It would not be in the Committee's remit to grant access to the paddock.

It was proposed by Councillor Allen, seconded by Councillor Derbyshire and upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 20/00603/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the conditions and reasons contained in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager and the amended conditions below:

Amended Condition 3 to read:

Materials Condition

Details and/or samples of materials to be used on all external elevations and the roof of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced and the approved details shall be implemented on site.

Reason: To ensure that the development will have an acceptable appearance which does not detract from the appearance and character of the surrounding area.

Condition 10:

Condition 10 in the report is to be removed as no longer required and replaced with the following Land Contamination Conditions (added and agreed by agent):

- (a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:
  - (i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;
  - (ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology

- (b) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (a), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- (c) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:
  - (i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (b) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.
  - (ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.
- (d) Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of condition (a) and (b), encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination affecting the site is dealt with in a manner that safeguards human health, the built and natural environment and controlled waters.

Councillor Moody rejoined the committee proceedings by enabling his camera and microphone.

**106 19/03033/FP GLYFADA, GOSMORE ROAD, HITCHIN, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG4 9BE**

*Audio Recording – 2 Hours 32 Minutes 46 Seconds*

Erection of six 4-bed and two 5-bed dwellings including creation of new vehicular access off of Hitchin Road following demolition of existing dwelling (revision of previous scheme granted permission under 17/02466/1 and 18/02810/NMA).

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report in respect of application 19/03033/FP supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

The following Members asked questions of the Principal Planning Officer:

- Councillor Mike Hughson.

In response to Councillor Hughson's question, the Principal Planning Officer informed that the applicant was Peter Davies Homes.

It was proposed by Councillor Levett, seconded by Councillor Allen and upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 19/03033/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the following:

- A) The submission of a satisfactory Unilateral Undertaking to secure £32,193.29 as a contribution towards services and infrastructure provided by Hertfordshire County Council;
- B) The conditions, informatives and reasons contained in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

Amended Condition 17 to read

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Phase 11 Geo-Environmental site investigation report (September 2018) and the submitted Remediation Method Statement (15<sup>th</sup> May 2020) by BRD Environmental Limited.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination affecting the site is dealt with in a manner that safeguards human health, the built and natural environment and controlled waters.

**107 20/00292/S73 40 DACRE ROAD, HITCHIN, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG5 1QJ**

*Audio Recording – 2 Hours 43 Minutes*

Variation to Condition 2 (insertion of front dormer windows) of Planning Permission 19/00249/FP granted 02/04/2019 for erection of one terrace of three 2-bed dwellings following demolition of existing bungalow (as amended by plan nos. PL02 E & PL03 D).

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report in respect of application 20/00292/S73 supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

The following Members asked questions of the Principal Planning Officer:

- Councillor Terry Tyler;
- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Ruth Brown; and
- Councillor Val Bryant.

In response to questions raised by Members, the Principal Planning Officer responded as follows:

- The item was called in by Councillor Ian Albert as he was concerned with the size and scale of the dormers and the parking;
- Dormers would require planning permission regardless of being in a Conservation Area;
- It was correct that the majority of dwellings do not have front dormers; and
- The front dormers do not have a jarring impact on the environment.

It was proposed by Councillor Levett, seconded by Councillor Allen and upon being put to the vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 20/00292/S73 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the conditions and reasons contained in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

**108 20/00012/FPH 11 COMMON RISE, HITCHIN, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG4 0HL**

*Audio Recording – 2 Hours 58 Minutes*

Part two storey, part single storey front extension, two storey rear extension, erection of single garage off existing access from Cooks Way following demolition of existing garage.

Before the Development and Conservation Manager introduced the report, Councillor Kay Tart advised the Committee that she was not a member of the Committee but would be speaking as a Member Advocate on the item. She further added that she would disable her video and microphone on the completion of her presentation.

The Development and Conservation Manager presented the report in respect of application 20/00012/FPH supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

Councillor David Levett raised a question regarding the report as under paragraph 4.1 – Neighbouring Notifications, 11 Common Rise had been listed as supporting the application.

In response to Councillor Levett's enquiry, the Development and Conservation Manager responded that it was unusual for the applicant to be making representation on their planning application. He further advised that Members should take this as an error.

Councillor Kay Tart, Member Advocate, thanked the Chair for the opportunity to speak in support of application 20/00012/FPH, including:

- There were errors in the report at paragraph 5.2.2. The height should be amended to read 4.8 metres instead of 5.1 metres, the elevation should be amended to read 6.3 instead of 6.8 and the width should be amended to read 4.2 instead of 4.4;
- The key issues for this application were accessibility, the impact on the area and car parking provision;
- There were a number of properties already on this street that had been extended. Therefore, despite this application being unique, it was not the first of its kind;
- There were already a large number of ground floor extensions, all with varying styles;
- There was no longer consistency in house styles on the road;
- The home owners had been considerate to neighbours and properties;
- The extension would not block neighbours' light or obstruct neighbours' windows;
- The risk of this application setting a precedent should not be grounds for refusing planning permission;
- This application should be supported and encouraged it was unique and would enhance the character of Common Rise; and
- Design and character should not be the deciding factor for refusing planning permission as the design would not impact the street.

The following Members sought clarification from Councillor Tart's presentation:

- Councillor Ian Mantle; and
- Councillor Daniel Allen.

In response to questions raised, Councillor Tart responded as follows:

- The half semi-detach was untouched and required modernisation; and
- The correct measurements were obtained from the applicant.

The Chair thanked Councillor Tart for her presentation.

Councillor Tart disabled her camera and microphone.

Mr Adam Thapar thanked the Chair for the opportunity to speak in support of application 20/00012/FPH, including:

- Fewer than 1 in 10 homes (approximately 7%) of the UK housing stock was disabled friendly and accessible;
- The extension focused on ensuring better accessibility throughout the ground and first floor;
- This proposal strived to improve living conditions for all people;
- The stairs were currently exceedingly steep and dangerous. To bring these to modern minimum required standards, the footprint of these would double in size;
- These stairs could not ever be modified to accept a stair lift;

- The removal of side facing windows (by way of a front extension) were in direct response to Emerging Planning Policy D3 which ensures no harm comes of living conditions to those living at the property or neighbours and the surrounds;
- Bedrooms on Common Rise typically overlooked one another from 1.5-2.5 meter distances;
- These proposed plans removed this unacceptable condition by pulling the first floor forward slightly to encourage forward facing windows to the habitable room;
- This application was led by a need for universal access into and throughout the property, and the right to privacy; and
- The property did not fall within any significant site of archaeological interest, within the conservation area or within the town centre.

The following Members sought clarification from Mr Thapar's presentation:

- Councillor David Levett.

In response to the Member's question, Mr Thapar responded that there was not an opportunity to raise the issue of accessibility with the Case Officer.

In response to points and questions raised, the Development and Conservation Manager responded as follows:

- Design was about context not just scale;
- Internal layout was not a planning factor;
- The focus point was the impact the proposal would have on the street scene; and
- The size errors outlined at 5.2.2 were minor discrepancies rather than errors.

Members briefly debated and sought clarification from the powerpoint presentation after which it was proposed by Councillor Levett, seconded by Councillor Prendergast and upon being put to the vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 20/00012/FPH be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the following conditions and reasons:

Condition 1:

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

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

Condition 2:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the details specified in the application and supporting approved documents and plans listed above.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with details which form the basis of this grant of permission.

Condition 3:

Details of materials to be used on all external elevations and the roof of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced and the approved details shall be implemented on site.

Reason: To ensure that the development will have an acceptable appearance which does not detract from the appearance and character of the surrounding area.

Proactive statement:

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted proactively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

**109 20/00374/LDCP 3 LIMEKILN LANE, BALDOCK, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG7 6PG**

*Audio Recording 3 Hours 34 Minutes 8 Seconds*

Extension of existing rear dormer and insertion of new window to first floor bedroom to rear.

The Development and Conservation advised the item was on the agenda as the applicant was an employee of the Council working in the Planning Department.

The Development and Conservation Manager presented the report in respect of application 20/00374/LDCP supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

It was proposed by Councillor Weeks, seconded by Councillor Brown and upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED:** That, in respect of application 20/00374/LDCP, a Lawful Development Certificate be **GRANTED**.

**110 20/00646/FPH GLEBEFIELD, LILLEY BOTTOM, LILLEY, LUTON, HERTFORDSHIRE, LU2 8NH**

*Audio Recording – 3 Hours 38 Minutes 23 Seconds*

Two storey side extension, porch and car port following demolition of existing single storey side extension.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report in respect of application 20/00646/FPH supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

It was proposed by Councillor Tyler, seconded by Councillor Brown and upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED:** That planning application 20/00646/FPH be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the conditions and reasons contained in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

**111 PLANNING APPEALS**

*Audio Recording – 3 Hours 43 Minutes 44 Seconds*

The Development and Conservation Manager presented the report entitled Planning Appeals.

**RESOLVED:** That the report entitled Planning Appeals be noted.

**Thursday, 28th May, 2020**

The meeting closed at 11.15 pm

Chair