

## **NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**MEETING HELD AS A VIRTUAL MEETING  
ON MONDAY, 12TH APRIL, 2021 AT 7.30 PM**

#### **MINUTES**

**Present:** *Councillors: Ruth Brown (Chair), Daniel Allen (Vice-Chair), Val Bryant, Morgan Derbyshire, Mike Hughson, Tony Hunter, David Levett, Sue Ngwala, Sean Prendergast, Mike Rice, Tom Tyson and George Davies (In place of Ian Moody)*

**In Attendance:** *Simon Ellis (Development and Conservation Manager), Nurainatta Katevu (Legal Regulatory Team Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer), Melissa Tyler (Senior Planning Officer), Sam Dicocco (Senior Strategic Sites Officer) and Anna Gouveia (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer)*

*Hertfordshire County Council Officers: Roger Taylor (Principal Engineer, Development Management), Ania Jakacka (Senior Highway Officer) Mark Youngman (Group Manager), Daniel Tancock (Strategy and Programmes Manager) and Dave Hill (Passenger Transport Unit)*

**Also Present:** *At the commencement of the meeting approximately 9 members of the public, including registered speakers. Councillors Carol Stanier, Helen Oliver and Jim McNally were in attendance as Member Advocates. William Edwards was also present as IT Support.*

#### **125 WELCOME AND REMOTE/PARTLY REMOTE MEETINGS PROTOCOL SUMMARY**

*Audio recording – 24 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.

There was also the opportunity for the public and press to listen to and view proceedings.

The Chair invited the Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer to explain how proceedings would work and to confirm that Members and Officers were in attendance.

The Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer undertook a roll call to ensure that all Members, Officers and registered speakers could hear and be heard and gave advice regarding the following:

The meeting was being streamed live onto YouTube and recorded via Zoom.

Extracts from the Remote/Partly Remote Meetings Protocol were included with the agenda and the full version was available on the Council's website which included information regarding:

- Live Streaming;
- Noise Interference;
- Rules of Debate; and
- Part 2 Items.

Members were requested to ensure that they were familiar with the Protocol.

The Chair of the Planning Control Committee, Councillor Ruth Brown, started the meeting proper.

**126 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

*Audio recording – 6 minutes 3 seconds*

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ian Moody.

Having given due notice, Councillor George Davies advised that he was substituting for Councillor Ian Moody.

**127 MINUTES - 18 MARCH 2021**

*Audio Recording – 6 minutes 13 seconds*

Councillor Ruth Brown proposed, Councillor Daniel Allen seconded and it was:

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 18 March 2021 be approved as a true record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chair; and
- (2) That, with the authorisation of the Chair, her electronic signature and initials be attached to the Minutes approved in (1) above.

**128 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS**

*Audio recording – 7 minutes 6 seconds*

There was no other business notified.

**129 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

*Audio recording – 7 minutes 11 seconds*

- (1) The Chair welcomed those present at the meeting, especially those who had attended to give a presentation;
- (2) The Chair advised that, in accordance with Council Policy, the meeting would be audio recorded;
- (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) To clarify matters for the registered speakers the Chair advised that members of the public had 5 minutes for each group of speakers i.e. 5 minutes for objectors and 5 minutes for supporters. This 5 minute time limit also applied to Member Advocates;
- (5) The Chair advised that the time provided for speeches had been extended for Item 8 only by 5 minutes for each group of speakers i.e. 10 minutes for objectors and 10 minutes for supporters. This 10 minute time limit also applied to Member Advocates;
- (6) The Chair advised that a comfort break would be held at around 9pm or after Item 7.

In response to a comment by Councillor Hunter, the Chair advised that careful planning would go into the scheduling of applications on future Committee agendas to avoid meetings going past 11pm where possible.

### **130 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

*Audio recording – 10 minutes 43 seconds*

The Chair confirmed that the registered speakers were in attendance.

### **131 20/00744/OP LAND OPPOSITE HEATH FARM, BRIARY LANE, ROYSTON, HERTFORDSHIRE**

*Audio recording – 10 minutes 54 seconds*

Outline planning application for up to 99 residential dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing), introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation, vehicular access point via the demolition of an existing property on Echo Hill (all matters to be reserved save access).

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report in respect of application 20/00744/OP supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans and provided the Committee with the following updates:

- Additional representations had been received since the publication of the report;
- Natural England had stated that following removal of the emergency access they had no objection subject to appropriate mitigation being secured by the Section 106;
- An email had been received from Therfield Heath Conservators regarding concerns about the report and recommendation being presented to the Committee this evening – this representation had been responded to and did not change the recommendation for approval or the details in the Heads of Terms in the Section 106;
- A letter from Buxton Solicitors on behalf of the action group 'Say No To Gladman' had been received and a response from the NHDC legal advisor had been sent covering the issues raised regarding access, the EIA, the tilted balance and the SSSI, and concluding that NHDC did not consider that there was a risk of judicial review should the Committee be minded to grant the application;
- A late representation had been received regarding land ownership and access. This issue had been raised numerous times and the applicant had responded stating that no third-party land has been included and this had been checked and confirmed on numerous occasions. Any dispute would be a civil matter and not a planning consideration.

Spelling mistakes and clarifications on the Report

- There was an error in the text of the Report at Section 1.4 – the text was out of date and should be in line with what was stated in Section 4.3.16 where the emerging Local Plan was now well advanced and the Local Plan Inspector had issued their proposed further modifications following the additional hearings earlier that year;
- 4.3.28 – there was a spelling mistake: ‘tiled balance’ should read ‘tilted balance’;
- 4.4.3 – ‘can be sustained at appeal’ should read ‘cannot be sustained at appeal’.

Conditions – changes to wording

- Condition 22 – Section E added ‘details of a phased landscaping scheme of all planting to be submitted with agreed triggers’;
- Condition 24 – ‘hedges’ had been added to trees in the wording where appropriate to ensure their protection;
- Informative 11, Design – Wording had been added so the first sentence would read: ‘Given the topography of the site and the general character of the area, as part of any reserve matter application, the inclusion of a single storey development on the more sensitive areas of the development should be considered and any development above two storeys needs to be carefully considered and adequately justified.’.

The following Member asked a question of clarification:

- Councillor David Levett.

The Senior Planning Officer responded as follows:

- The planners had given pre-application advice that means of access, layout and scale should be dealt with at outline stage, however the applicant had chosen not to go down that route and therefore the application as presented had been considered.

Ms Melanie Hill and Ms Clare Swarbrick thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 20/00744/OP.

Ms Hill gave a verbal presentation including:

- Ms Hill represented the group ‘Royston Says No to Gladman’ and over 450 residents and households who objected to the application;
- She also lived next to the property due to be demolished;
- This application was worse than the previous application in terms of access, planning balance and sustainability;
- There were safety concerns with regard to the demolition of the adjoining property. Gladman had offered to buy two further properties to demolish for access;
- Restrictive covenants existed on every property on Echo Hill which residents would enforce;
- Deeds showed that the applicant did not own all the land required for access;
- Several of Hertfordshire County Council Highways (HCCH) Planning Conditions (including No 5 and No 1) could not be achieved, in relation to achieving gradients and also reserved matters relating to access;
- The Demand Responsive Transport proposed to deal with the lack of a bus stop within 400 metres of the development was in her view flawed;
- The Conservators of Therfield Heath and Greens had refused permission for mitigation works on their land, and were very unhappy with the detail of S106 proposals;

**Monday, 12th April, 2021**

- In her view HCCH had failed in their statutory duty to consult under point 3 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and NHDC should have made available to the public or other consultees the evidence used in accordance with The Town and Country Planning Order 2015;
- No time had been given for public consultation on Natural England's response;
- In her view there was no credible evidence of SSSI mitigation measures;
- No new EIA had been carried out;
- The NPPF specifically stated that local authorities could refuse such schemes, even if the five-year land supply had yet to be agreed, if the adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits as she considered they did in this case.

The following Members asked questions of clarification:

- Councillor Tom Tyson;
- Councillor Daniel Allen;
- Councillor Mike Rice.

Ms Clare Swarbrick responded to questions as follows:

- Residents on Echo Hill would be prepared to enforce the covenant which stated that the properties could not be demolished;
- Three documents had not been seen by residents;
- The applicant did not own all the land required for access – there was a boundaries dispute between numbers 23 and 24;
- It was noted that 350 viewers were currently watching the meeting via YouTube.

Councillor Carol Stanier, Member Advocate, thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 20/00744/OP.

Councillor Carol Stanier gave a verbal presentation including:

- Access to the site via Briary Lane/ Sun Hill was narrow and heavily parked up;
- The road was not suitable as the only access to a large estate and for the large amount of traffic this development would generate;
- Large vehicles already had problems accessing parts of Echo Hill;
- The development was too far from the centre to walk or cycle with Echo Hill being very steep;
- The development would be an obstacle to achieving the Sustainable Travel Town status as it would encourage car use over alternative more sustainable means of transport;
- The proposed development was not in the current or emerging local plan and it was a greenfield site;
- The proposed development threatened biodiversity and the SSSI;
- There would be a negative impact on the view of the landscape, particularly from the Heath;
- Royston Town Council strongly objected to the development;
- Concerns regarding NHDC's fulfilment of its statutory duties should be resolved before proceeding.

Ms Sian Gulliver thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in support of application 20/00744/OP.

Ms Gulliver gave a verbal presentation including:

- Gladman had worked closely with officers and statutory consultees to address any concerns raised, and all of the reasons for refusal of the previous application had been overcome;
- The proposed number of dwellings had been reduced and measures including additional structural planting, landscape buffers and a reduction in the scale and density of development along the development edge had been incorporated, to ensure the development would be assimilated into the local landscape;
- The substantial on-site open space provision, including new walking routes, in combination with a financial contribution towards a warden as part of the heath management programme, would ensure that the development had no detrimental impact on the SSSI;
- Following the removal of a proposed emergency access off Briary Lane, which was not required to make a safe access, no part of the application site lay within the SSSI land;
- Access from Echo Hill was deemed safe and acceptable to County Council highways officers;
- The applicant had agreed to a financial contribution of £120,000 to enable their current Demand Responsive Transport Service coverage area to be extended to cater for this site. This would ensure that new residents had access to an affordable public transport service directly from and back to their homes;
- In the context of a five-year housing land supply of just 2.2 years, equating to a significant shortfall of more than 3,300 houses, the delivery of up to 99 dwellings on this site, including 40% affordable, would make an important contribution to the Council's future supply;
- The development would revert ecologically poor farmland to chalk heathland habitat, enhancing biodiversity;
- Footway improvements would be made along Sun Hill to improve pedestrian connectivity into the town centre;
- The proposals incorporated a range of measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change. For example, every home would be equipped with an electric vehicle charging point and cycle or mobility vehicle storage, and more than 50% would have south-facing habitable rooms, so would benefit from solar gain.
- As concluded by the case officer, conflict with policy would not in itself significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposals, and it had been established that there were no technical matters precluding planning permission being granted.

The following Members asked questions of clarification:

- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Ruth Brown.

Ms Gulliver responded to questions including:

- Following pre-application advice, Gladman produced a revised scheme and were satisfied that remaining matters could be dealt with at reserved matters stage;
- Detailed drawings had been prepared for the access proposals and it had been demonstrated that the gradients would allow the application site to be accessed suitably. This had also been agreed by Highways and no concerns had been raised about accessibility for wheelchair users.

**Monday, 12th April, 2021**

Mr Roger Taylor, Hertfordshire County Council responded to points raised regarding highways as follows:

- The gradient was 1:15 which was less than the existing road which was 1:20 and a mobility scooter would be able to go up such a slope;
- Safety Audits were usually carried out on new developments and new roads, or roads with a history of accidents which this road did not have;

The Senior Planning Officer responded to a question regarding the ownership of land as follows:

- There was a disagreement concerning the ownership of land which was a civil matter and not a planning consideration.

In response to a Point of Order from Councillor David Levett, Councillor Ruth Brown confirmed that she did not have a declarable interest as she did not sit on the Royston Town Council Planning Committee.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Tony Hunter;
- Councillor George Davies;
- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Ruth Brown;
- Councillor Daniel Allen.

Points raised in the debate included:

- A Safety Audit of Echo Hill was not present in the documentation and Safety Audits had been done in the past for other planning applications in the area;
- The site proposed was not included in the emerging Local Plan (which was close to being implemented) and did not comply with all the policies in it;
- The covenants on the Echo Hill houses and the fact that this was an application for Outline Planning Permission meant that the scheme would not be immediately deliverable therefore would not help with the housing delivery test;
- The application had only 8 units less than the previous one;
- The Demand Responsive Transport scheme would only last as long as the £120,000 provided for it was available unless it was a commercial operation;
- Any benefits did not clearly outweigh the demonstrable and significant impacts on the area, particularly Therfield Heath and the views from it;
- The development was in conflict with Saved Policy 6, CGB1, SP5 and NE1 of the emerging local plan;

The Development and Conservation Manager advised the Committee on possible grounds for refusal.

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

**RESOLVED:** That application 20/00744/OP be **REFUSED** planning permission for the following reasons:

- (1) By reason of its prominent position and the topography of the site and location outside the settlement boundary of Royston, the proposed development would be likely to result in significant localised adverse impacts on both the character of the area and visual receptors, particularly when viewed from certain locations on Royston Heath. While these impacts could be mitigated to a limited extent, the combination of residential built form on high ground and the associated urbanising infrastructure, and development breaking the skyline, would act to occasion a marked and adverse change in the character of the immediate and intermediate locality and wider valued landscape. This adverse impact would represent conflict with the aims of the NPPF and Policies CGB1, SP5, SP12c and NE1 of the emerging local plan and Policies 6 and 21 of the Saved local plan.
- (2) At the time of determination the planning application, the subject of this decision notice, has not been accompanied by a valid legal undertaking (in the form of a completed S106 Obligation) securing the provision of the requisite infrastructure and financial contributions towards off site infrastructure or on site affordable housing. The secure delivery of these obligations is required to mitigate the impact of the development on the identified services in accordance with the adopted Planning Obligations SPD, Saved Policy 51 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No. 2 - with Alterations or proposed Local Plan Policy HS2 of the Submission Local Plan (2011-2031). Without this mechanism to secure these provisions the development scheme cannot be considered as a sustainable form of development contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

**Proactive Statement:**

Planning permission has been refused for this proposal for the clear reasons set out in this decision notice. The Council acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant in an attempt to narrow down the reasons for refusal but fundamental objections could not be overcome. 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.

*NB: The Committee took a comfort break at 20.56*

*The meeting resumed at 21.04 at which time the Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer undertook a roll call.*

**132 19/00520/OP LAND BETWEEN CROFT LANE NORTON ROAD AND CASHIO LANE, LETCHWORTH GARDEN CITY, HERTFORDSHIRE**

*Audio recording – 1 hour 37 minutes 21 seconds*

Outline planning application for residential development of up to 42 dwellings, all matters reserved but access (as amended by plans and information received 09-06-2020, 23-07-2020 and 10-12-2020).

It was confirmed that none of the Committee Members were Hertfordshire County Councillors and therefore did not have a declarable interest as Hertfordshire County Council owned the land.



Councillor Morgan Derbyshire declared that he was acting as Member Advocate on this item and would therefore not take part in the debate and vote.

The Senior Strategic Sites Officer presented the report in respect of application 19/00520/OP and provided the Committee with the following updates:

- There was a technical issue with the Planning Officer's report in that the Conditions requested had not been fully included in the report which had been published on the website;
- Condition 1: Reference to 'means of access' had been deleted and replaced with 'internal access', as means of access was unreserved within the application under consideration;
- Conditions 3 and 4: reference to 'demolition' had been removed, as no demolition was proposed at part of this development;
- Highways Conditions 16-21: All of the beginnings of these Conditions had been updated to include: 'The occupation of development authorised by this permission shall not begin...' and then continue to have exactly the same contents other than the following:
- Condition 17: Drawing number ST-2571-22 Swept Path Analysis Croft Lane Option 7b had been added;
- Condition 18 had been shortened and would now read as follows:

'The occupation of the development authorised by this permission shall not begin until the offsite highway improvement works as indicated on drawings numbered ST-2571-21-A Means of Access Croft Lane Option 7b, ST-2571-18-B Croft Lane Access Strategy and ST-2571-22 Swept Path Analysis Croft Lane Option 7b have been undertaken. The potential footway and crossing on Norton Road (contribution towards Highway Authority) presented on drawing Croft Lane Access Strategy, ST-2571-18-B should be changed to: Provision of footway and signalised pedestrian crossing on Norton Road (the works to be undertaken under s278 works). The works shall be completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority and highway authority before occupation of the development.'

Reason: To ensure construction of satisfactory development that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and amenity and in accordance with Policies 5, 13 and 21 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

- Former Points a, b and c of Condition 18 had been removed as they were included in up-to-date drawings, so did not need to be included in the Condition. The Condition did not reduce the amount of s278 works required or the works required on the road to make the access safe;
- There were two additional prior to commencement Conditions: Condition 25 to ensure that the details of the offsite highway improvement works are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, the details to include surface materials, footpath surfaces, kerbs, grass verges, bollards, signage, street lighting within the site, road markings and paintings, and details of the speed tables and Sinusoidal ramps proposed offsite. This condition was to ensure that best efforts were made, in terms of fine detailing, to preserve the quality of the site surroundings as a heritage asset;
- Condition 26 which requires that the offsite highway improvement works shown on the proposed details and plans provide details of how the trees off the site are going to be protected whilst undertaking the s278 works to improve offsite highways provision, that includes the widening of Croft Lane at the access points and the widening of the footpaths to two metres as detailed in the officer's report and as detailed in the approved drawings.

Councillor Allen raised a Point of Order that with this level of change to the report, with the Committee not having had time to review it, and due to the fact that some objectors had employed highways consultants (and the changed Conditions related to highways and access), he did not think the Committee should be considering this application any further at this meeting.

The Legal Regulatory Team Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer advised that deferral for the reason given by Councillor Allen was a matter for Members to decide upon. The Development and Conservation Manager confirmed that the earliest date which the Committee could consider the deferred application would be 27 May 2021.

The following Members commented on the proposed deferral:

- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Tony Hunter;
- Councillor Mike Rice.

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

**RESOLVED:** That application 19/00520/OP be **DEFERRED** for the following reason:

To allow the Committee sufficient time to consider updated information.

**133 20/01098/FP THE BOOT, 73 HIGH STREET, BALDOCK, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG7 6BP**

*Audio recording – 1 hour 53 minutes 03 seconds*

Two storey side extension, first floor rear and side extensions and change of use of building from Public House and three bedroom flat to C3 Residential to create 4no two bedroom flats and 2no one bedroom flats (as amended by plans received November 2020).

Councillor Sean Prendergast declared an interest in that his mother-in-law owned a property in Pinnocks Lane which was at the back of the proposed development and advised that he would not take part in the debate or vote on this item.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report in respect of application 20/01098/FP supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

The following Members asked questions of clarification:

- Councillor Daniel Allen;
- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Mike Rice.

Points raised included:

- The parking spaces provided would be challenging for larger vehicles to use due to the lack of space in the parking area shown in the plans.

In response to questions raised, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- Each car parking space had standard dimensions (approx. 4.8m x approx. 2.14m);
- The Parking SPD dictated that a two bedroomed property would require two spaces and a one bedroomed property would require one space, so to meet the policy, the development would require 10 parking spaces but it only had 4;
- As this was a sustainable location, a view could be taken on providing fewer spaces, in accordance with the Parking SPD;
- More spaces had originally been included but Highways had requested that spaces only be provided that would allow vehicles to enter and exit in a forward gear.

Mr Doug Neath thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 20/01098/FP.

Mr Neath gave a verbal presentation including:

- He was representing the residents who had complained;
- They had no objection to the change of use but they objected to a number of serious issues, particularly the extension intended to be built on the existing beer garden;
- There were insufficient parking spaces and new residents may try find alternative parking in Pinnocks Lane and Pinnocks Close, where parking was already very limited;
- If the County Council's proposal to introduce double yellow lines along part of these roads went ahead there would not be enough places for residents to park, and they too may have to resort to parking in the High Street causing even more congestion;
- There were concerns over the impact of the proposed extension on the residents in Pinnocks Lane - the height of the proposed extension would greatly diminish the outlook of the properties and would drastically cut down the amount of sunlight reaching them. Some of the residents were keen gardeners who grew flowers and vegetables all year round, and this would seriously affect their ability to continue to do so;
- The extension included three windows which were close to, and overlooked the neighbouring properties, therefore seriously affecting their right to privacy;
- The proposed balcony was extremely close and overlooked the gardens of numbers 3 and 5 Pinnocks Lane leading to a lack of privacy and there was concern over any increased noise levels which may arise from residents using the balcony;
- The site had no provision for any communal area for the occupants to sit outside, or for children to play, nor space to undertake any outside tasks such as drying clothes or washing cars;
- It was felt that the development had been designed to fit as many flats as possible onto the site without any thought for those living there or the surrounding neighbourhood;
- It was considered that the development did not make the best use of the existing building, there was little attempt to make it environmentally friendly, e.g. use of solar panels, and it will not provide a healthy and friendly environment in which to live.

The following Members asked questions of clarification:

- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Daniel Allen.

Mr Neath responded to questions including:

- Residents had received a letter in January from the County Council proposing double yellow lines in the area to ease the flow of traffic;
- The development would block the sun from neighbouring gardens in the afternoons.

Councillor Jim McNally, Member Advocate, thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 20/01098/FP.

Councillor Jim McNally gave a verbal presentation including:

- Residents and businesses were not against the change of use but there were serious concerns about the density of the development, its design in relation to waste bin provision, and the lack of parking which would seriously impact on the local area;
- There did not seem to be adequate space provided for refuse and recycling bins for each dwelling at the development;
- The development did not adhere to the parking policy set out in the Local Plan;
- The parking bays which were provided were small with little room for manoeuvre which could encourage neighbour disputes and anti-social behaviour;
- The on-street parking outside the development was already very busy;
- Parking in the Pinnocks Lane area was already over-subscribed and the situation critical.

Mr Tom Donovan thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Committee in support of application 20/01098/FP.

Mr Donovan gave a verbal presentation including:

- The applicant believed that the scheme proposed represented the most sensible use of the site in contributing housing to the shortfall in the district;
- The site was no longer viable as a public house;
- These units were deliverable in the short-term;
- Four parking spaces had been provided which represented a compromise between allocating some car parking and making the development appealing to those who did not have a private vehicle;
- The location was sustainable in proximity to shops and local businesses as well as bus and rail facilities – the SPD contained a mechanism to allow reduction in parking provision in such a situation;
- Other developments had been approved recently with no parking given their highly sustainable locations;
- The Highways Authority had confirmed that the four parking spaces met the necessary standards and were acceptable;
- The discouragement of car parking at the site supported the Council's aim to reduce carbon as alternative methods of transport were being encouraged;
- The balcony in the design had been removed following negotiations;
- Waste provision was intended to be compliant with the Council's waste standards using communal bins provided in the usual way.

The following Member asked a questions of clarification:

- Councillor Daniel Allen

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Daniel Allen;
- Councillor Tony Hunter;
- Councillor Sue Ngwala;
- Councillor David Levett;
- Councillor Mike Rice;
- Councillor Tom Tyson.

Comments from Members included:

- This was considered to be a good development but parking was a concern for several Members, particularly knowing how bad the parking was in that area;
- The loss of privacy and daylight had been dealt with in the report;
- Refusal on the grounds of lack of parking provision was unlikely to be successful at appeal due to Town Centre developments often being built without any parking;
- A smaller development (less flats) might be more suitable as less parking spaces would be required;
- The location was sustainable with a bus stop and being in the Town Centre;
- There were concerns over proposals to put in double yellow lines in the area which would further reduce the amount of parking available;
- Residents of recent developments which had been approved without parking were finding it a struggle.

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

**RESOLVED:** That application 20/01098/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the conditions and reasons contained in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

#### 134 PLANNING APPEALS

*Audio recording – 2 hours 40 minutes 6 seconds*

There were no Planning Appeals to report on at the meeting.

The meeting closed at 10.11 pm

Chair