

## NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES,  
LETCWORTH GARDEN CITY  
ON THURSDAY, 15TH DECEMBER, 2022 AT 7.30 PM

#### MINUTES

**Present:** *Councillors: Val Bryant (Chair), Tom Tyson (Vice-Chair), Alistair Willoughby, David Levett, Morgan Derbyshire, Simon Bloxham, Terry Tyler, Nigel Mason, Steve Jarvis, Michael Muir and Tony Hunter*

**In Attendance:** *Nurainatta Katevu (Legal Regulatory Team Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer), James Lovegrove (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager), Tom Allington (Acting Development and Conservation Manager), Peter Bull (Senior Planning Officer), Alex Howard (Planning Officer), Naomi Reynard (Senior Planning Officer) and Tom Marsh (Electoral Services Manager)*

**Also Present:** *At the commencement of the meeting approximately 8 members of the public, including registered speakers and Member Advocates..*

#### 41 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

*Audio recording – 1 minute 23 seconds*

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sean Nolan, Daniel Allen, Phil Weeder and Ian Moody.

Having given due notice, Councillor Nigel Mason substituted for Councillor Sean Nolan, Councillor Steve Jarvis substituted for Councillor Phil Weeder and Councillor Michael Muir substituted for Councillor Ian Moody.

#### 42 MINUTES - 17 NOVEMBER 2022

*Audio Recording – 2 minutes 32 seconds*

Councillor Val Bryant, as Chair, proposed and Councillor Tom Tyson seconded and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 17 November 2022 be approved as a true record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chair.

#### 43 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

*Audio recording – 3 minutes 33 seconds*

There was no other business notified.

#### 44 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

*Audio recording – 3 minutes 38 seconds*

(1) The Chair advised that, in accordance with Council Policy, the meeting would be recorded.

- (2) 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.
- (3) The Chair clarified the speaking process for public participants.
- (4) The Chair advised of a change to the order of the agenda and Item 6 would be taken last, following the conclusion of Item 10.
- (5) The Chair advised of when comfort breaks would be taken.

#### 45 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

*Audio recording – 5 minutes 07 seconds*

The Chair confirmed the registered speakers were in attendance.

#### 46 19/01448/FP Former Wyevale Codicote Garden Centre, High Street, Codicote, Hitchin, Hertfordshire, SG4 8XA

*Audio recording – 78 minutes 08 seconds*

The Senior Planning Officer provided the following updates:

- Herts Ecology had raised concerns of the ability to meet 10% biodiversity net gain and the applicant had been requested to provide further information. This information had now been received and Herts Ecology had confirmed that they believe this can be achieved within the site boundary.
- The proposed section 106 clause in the event 10% biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved on site can be removed.
- Herts Ecology had proposed two further conditions, and these were incorporated into Conditions 7 and 18 and the pre-commencement Condition 7 had been agreed with the applicant.
- An update to the section 106 obligations table was provided, advising that they youth contribution would go to a facility in Hitchin, not Welwyn as written in the report.
- The section 106 monitoring fees had been updated.
- Condition 21.e should refer to drawing no. '6729.MOS PP.4.0 Rev C'.
- One further representation had been made from a local resident following the publication of the report and this was available on the Council website.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report in respect of application 19/01448/FP supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor David Levett
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Michael Muir
- Councillor Tom Tyson

In response to questions, the Senior Planning Officer advised:

- The Car Club Scheme was felt to be more enforceable as a section 106 clause and had previously been included on the Heath Lane proposals.

**Thursday, 15th December, 2022**

- The attenuation pond was included within the red line of the site and it would be a basin in the land in case of excess water, but it was expected to be mostly empty. This was part of the sustainable urban drainage features.
- The application was submitted with a Transport Statement which concluded that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on the operation of the highway networks in the vicinity of the site or on road safety.
- Without an objection from the Highways Authority, it would not be recommended to refuse on these grounds.

The Chair invited Councillor Ralph Muncer to speak as Member Advocate against the application, in place of the ward member Councillor Ian Moody. Councillor Muncer thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including:

- Of the four Codicote sites in the Local Plan, the residents view this site as the most appropriate, but that did not mean they did not have concerns.
- It was important for the Council and the developer to work together to find outcomes beneficial for residents.
- The site sits at the end of a national speed limit zone and whilst an alternative is being worked on, not formal consideration to this had been given.
- The site is also located opposite a known dangerous junction.
- The traffic on the road is already bad and this is made worse when the A1(M) is closed, forcing traffic through Codicote. Suitable signage and road layout would be required to mitigate this.
- Residents had made numerous complaints about the continued breaches of conditions on the site, including dust, noise and inconsiderate parking.
- Within the village there were three major sites under construction within a 600m radius. All of these sites were using the High Street for access, which was causing major issues on roads not suited for the HGVs visiting the sites.
- There had been noticeable positive changes since the commencement of the Heath Lane, demonstrating lessons had been learned.
- Some proposed additional conditions included; having a site management plan in place, parking and delivery restrictions, compulsory washing of vehicles before leaving the site, no weekend working, no removal of hedgerows and regular site visits from Officers.

The Chair invited Mr Nick Stafford to speak in support of the application. Mr Stafford thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including:

- The site would provide much needed affordable homes.
- The application had tracked the Local Plan process and considerable interaction had taken place with Officers during the process.
- The applicant had consulted the community in 2019 with detailed proposals and were given feedback from residents.
- The Local Plan had now been adopted and the site had been removed from the greenbelt.
- The work put in during the wait for the adoption of the Local Plan meant that this was a high quality scheme, producing an attractive environment.
- The dwellings would be well spaced and boundary re-planting would only take place where existing plants were dead or dying.
- Section 106 clauses had been agreed with the Council.
- A transport plan was provided with the application, highlighting negligible changes in emission between its use as a residential site and a former garden centre.
- The suds basin would be mostly dry and only required during flooding and would be located on land owned by the developer.
- Every house would have EV charging by condition and where possible new energy technology would be used.
- There would be hedgehog highways, bee bricks and provision for birds and bats to protect wildlife.

In response to points raised, the Senior Planning Officer advised:

- Highways had not objected on safety grounds and have recommended conditions be applied, so it would be difficult to refuse on these grounds or place additional highways conditions.
- The construction management was covered by Condition 7. This condition would cover many of the issues raised.
- The conditions applied have to be reasonable and enforceable and a standard informative had been included regarding working hours, and therefore would not be reasonable to place additional conditions on this.
- Deliveries outside of school pick off and drop off had been covered by the construction management plan condition.
- Requested monthly site visits by Officers would not be deemed reasonable or enforceable.
- An Arboriculture Assessment had been provided with the application detailing which trees were to be removed.

Councillor Alistair Willoughby noted that more of the points raised by Councillor Muncer had been addressed in the conditions included within the report.

Councillor David Levett noted that he had no issues with the site for development as it fell within the Local Plan. However, he was concerned that cumulative impact on highways had not been considered. As detailed in 4.1.88 of the report the Inspector had wanted consideration to be given to the wider implications and cumulative effects on the community. He suggested that an additional condition be included to require an updated Transport Assessment, to take into account the cumulative impact of developments in Codicote.

In response to points raised and the proposed additional condition by Councillor Levett, the Acting Development and Conservation Manager advised that two of the four Codicote sites had submitted cumulative impact assessments, and these were found to be acceptable. He confirmed that it could be required by condition on this application prior to commencement.

Councillor Alistair Willoughby proposed, subject to the amendment above, and Councillor David Levett seconded and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That application 19/01448/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and the applicant agreeing to extend the statutory period in order to complete the agreement if required, as well as the reasons set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, with the following amendments to Conditions 7 and 18, and an additional Condition 41, to read:

“Condition 7

“No works or development (including any pre-construction, demolition or enabling works) shall commence until a Construction Management Plan/construction phasing and environmental management programme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including elements of the CLOCS standards as set out in the Highway Authority's Construction Management template. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan/Programme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority: The Construction Management Plan/construction phasing and environmental management programme shall include details of:

- Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing.
- Access arrangements to the site.
- Traffic management requirements.

- Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking, loading /unloading and turning areas).
- Siting and details of wheel washing facilities (for construction vehicles leaving the site).
- Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway.
- Timing of construction activities/hours of construction operations (including delivery times and removal of waste) and to avoid school pick up/drop off times.
- Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities.
- Site set up and general arrangements for storing plant including cranes, materials, machinery and equipment, temporary offices and other facilities, construction vehicle parking and loading/unloading and vehicle turning areas.
- Where works cannot be contained wholly within the site a plan should be submitted showing the site layout on the highway including extent of hoarding, pedestrian routes, and remaining road width for vehicle movements.
- Phasing Plans.
- Measures to minimise dust, noise, machinery and traffic noise impacts during construction.
- The location of construction traffic routes to and from the site, details of their signing, monitoring and enforcement measures.
- Screening and hoarding details, to protect neighbouring residents.
- End of day tidying procedures to ensure protection of the site outside the hours of construction. The construction activities shall be designed and undertaken in accordance with the code of best practice set out in British Standard 5228 1997 and with the agreed details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- Storage and removal of building waste for disposal or recycling.
- Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway.
- Ecological method statements to incorporate: MM1 – General Construction Safeguards, MM2 – Hedgerow and Tree Protection, MM7– Badger Construction Safeguard, MM9- Precautionary Habitat Clearance Measures and MM10 -Timing of Works from the Ecological Appraisal April 2019 by Aspect Ecology

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018) and to ensure the correct phasing of development in the interests of minimising disruption nearby residents during construction, minimising any environmental impacts and in the interests of biodiversity.”

“Condition 18

No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a scheme of external lighting has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be designed to ensure public safety and to minimise the potential effects upon the ecology of the site and its surroundings. The scheme shall include details of external lighting of the pedestrian accesses on the eastern boundary. The strategy shall be designed to minimise the potential adverse effects of external lighting on the amenity and biodiversity of the site and its immediate surroundings. The external lighting scheme should incorporate the considerations outlined within MM6 – Sensitive Lighting within the Ecological Appraisal April 2019 by Aspect Ecology an ecological lighting statement giving detail of definitive measures as to how this has been achieved. The scheme shall be implemented as approved and in accordance with an agreed programme/strategy, and the arrangements shall be maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity and local amenity.”

“Condition 41

Prior to the commencement of development an updated Transport Assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Transport

Assessment shall consider the cumulative impacts of sites CD1, CD2, CD3 and CD5 on the village centre and minor roads leading to/from Codicote and secure necessary mitigation or improvement measures. No dwelling forming part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the approved mitigation and/or improvement measures have been implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and traffic management.”

**47 22/02450/S73 Odyssey Health Club , Old Knebworth Lane, Knebworth, Hertfordshire, SG2 8DU**

*Audio recording – 5 minutes 45 seconds*

The Acting Development and Conservation Manager advised of the following updates:

- A new amended plan had been received. This did not contain any material changes to the proposal but corrected one of the labels on the floor plans.
- Section 73 amendment to the application approved by Committee in November 2020, to vary Conditions 2 and 17.

The Acting Development and Conservation Manager presented the report in respect of application 22/02450/S73 supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

Councillor David Levett proposed and Councillor Tony Hunter seconded and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That application 22/02450/S73 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the reasons set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager

**48 17/01955/1 Ickleford Mill, Arlesey Road, Ickleford**

*Audio recording – 10 minutes 37 seconds*

The Senior Planning Officer advised of the following updates:

- An addendum to the report had been circulated to Members and uploaded to Mod Gov, which updated paragraphs within the report and clarified that the pumping station could be placed in the greenbelt as it was part of the engineering operation of the site.
- Provided a correction to paragraph 4.3.34 of the report, relating to the Public Open Space.
- The Environmental Health Officer had proposed an amendment to Condition 29, to remove the need for the application to provide information already provided.
- Clarified the contributions to the Herts Growth and Infrastructure Unit and updates to where the Section 106 money would be allocated.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report in respect of application 17/01955/1 supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

The Chair invited Mr Gavin Winter to speak in support of the application. Mr Winter thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including:

- In 2015 the flour business on the site was sold to prioritise the ingredients division, but this had now moved to Biggleswade.
- Therefore the site is now redundant and is not suitable to other employment opportunities.
- The site was previously developed land within a class A village and a site that had been identified in the adopted Local Plan.

Thursday, 15th December, 2022

- The outline application offered 40% affordable housing, an excess of 10% biodiversity net gain and Section 106 contributions.
- Other than required engineering works, the section of the site included within the greenbelt was planned to remain as open space for use by residents.
- All the issues raised during the consultation period had been dealt with.
- The removal of the existing buildings on hard standing land will aim drainage on site and water from the houses would flow to the Hitchin processing site.
- The Highways Officer had approved the plans for zebra crossings, footpaths and dropped curbs.
- The application conforms with the policies included in the Local Plan, including improving the local environment, drainage and ecology benefits.
- The proposals complement the village character and provides much needed housing.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor David Levett
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Simon Bloxham

In response to points of clarification, Mr Winter advised that:

- The intention for the access to the site was to reduce this to a size more suited to a residential development, at the moment it was primarily access for HGVs to the site.
- The applicant had engaged with County Highways Officers to ensure that there were adequate crossing points included and the location of this was agreed, with which the Officer was satisfied.

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

- Chalk streams were not currently legally protected. The issues with pollution of chalk streams is usually down to surface water run-off and at the moment the surface water run-off on site goes into the foul water system.
- The proposals would see this changed and reduce the risk of flooding. The LLFA were seeking greenfield run-off that could be imposed by condition.
- There were other options to mitigate against surface water run-off and improve the risk to the chalk streams.
- The conditions outlined in the report deal with a lot of the issues raised during consultation by the Parish Council and neighbours. It was felt that these conditions were robust enough to offer protection at reserved matters stage.

Councillor David Levett noted that he knew the site well and there were vast concreted areas and therefore he could see how this proposal will improve water run off on site. He commented that this was an outline planning application with good conditions applied.

Councillor Tony Hunter echoed the comments made by Councillor Levett.

In response to a question from Councillor Alistair Willoughby, the Senior Planning Officer advised that the area of land proposed to stay as green space was outside of the Parish and therefore could not be adopted by the Parish Council. However, Officers were assured that the protection offered by conditions protected this land.

Councillor David Levett proposed and Councillor Tony Hunter seconded and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That application 17/01955/1 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory S106 Legal Agreement and the reasons set out in the report of

the Development and Conservation Manager, with the following amendment to Condition 29 to read:

“Condition 29:

- (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 (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 & natural environment & controlled waters.”

**49 22/01229/FP Land Adjacent To Red Brick Cottage, The Street, Kelshall, Royston, Hertfordshire, SG8 9SQ**

*Audio recording – 30 minutes 12 seconds*

The Planning Officer provided the following updates:

- An amended ecological assessment was submitted on 6 December, but this did not change the report.
- A number of emails had been circulated, including a statement from the ecologist, a statement from the agent of the applicant and further details on the plans regarding hedgerows.
- The report details that the hedgerow would be removed, but the amended plans show that of the 55 metres of hedgerow, 12.5m would be removed and 8.3m would be replanted, leaving a space of around 4.2m for access.
- Point 4.3.38 of the report should read that the ‘proposed development would *not* result in an increase in flooding.’
- Councillor Morris, who had called in the application, had emailed Natural England to comment, but no response had yet been received.

The Planning Officer presented the report in respect of application 22/01229/FP supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Tom Tyson
- Councillor Michael Muir

In response to questions, the Planning Officer advised:

- There was roughly 12m of hedgerow to be removed and around 8.5m would be replanted, with new planting.
- The new hedgerows to be planted total 121m in length, which would be 116.8m more hedgerow than on site currently.
- The pond shown on plans was owned by the applicant, but it was outside of the application area, shown by the red line on the plans.
- It would not be possible to condition the applicant to maintain the pond, as this was outside of the application area.

The Chair invited Mr Peter Gartside to speak against the application. Mr Gartside thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including:

- He was representing the Parish Council and the objections of the parishioners are well documented.
- There was much to like in the adopted Local Plan and they had no objections to the policy of infilling, but this application was on an awkward site squeezed between a footpath and a road.
- The village dated back to Domesday and was popular with walkers.
- For residents this site was the least suitable site for infill and there were concerns that if this application was allowed, much more infill would happen in the village.
- Kelshall was currently made up of 44 houses, with spacing between each dwelling.
- If all infill applications were the size of this application, there would be an additional 38 homes of this size in Kelshall.
- This would drastically alter the character of the village and would not accord with the term 'limited infill' described in the Local Plan.
- If this application was approved it would make infill developments a first-come-first-served basis and developers would be driving policy, not planning officers.
- Kelshall was a category B village in the Local Plan and was one of the smallest for infill possibilities.

The Chair invited Councillor Gerald Morris to speak against the application, as Member Advocate. Councillor Morris thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, including:

- The Local Plan allowed for small scale infill.
- He had previously supported an infill application, but this site was different, as it was part of a larger 6-acre field, although the application site had now been fenced off.
- The Planning Officer could not have envisaged a 6-acre field being infill for a £1million house.
- The application would see the partial removal of 65m of hedgerow, which is at least 500 years old. There are conditions protecting ancient hedgerows and this stipulates that those over 30m and 20 years old should not be removed.
- No response had been received from Herts Ecology for this proposal.
- The replacement hedgerow proposed would take generations to be a suitable alternative.
- Herts County Rights of Way and the Environment Agency had not been consulted.

Thursday, 15th December, 2022

- The site was part of several protected zones and Herts County Council guidelines stated that the patterns of lanes and hedging should be protected.
- If this application was granted permission it would lead to further similar applications in Kelshall and the ancient village character would be harmed.

In response to a point of clarification from Councillor Levett, Councillor Morris advised that the current use of the land was for grazing by livestock. He noted that a section had been fenced off recently to separate it from the wider meadow.

In response to points raised, the Planning Officer noted that:

- Highways were happy with the access, along with proposed signage, following a speed test.
- Due to the nature and scale of this development, it was unlikely Historic England or CPRE would have responded.
- Speculation on future development cannot be used as a reason for refusal.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Steve Jarvis
- Councillor Michael Muir
- Councillor Tom Tyson
- Councillor David Levett

Points raised in the debate included:

- The issue with the application was regarding whether or not it represented infill.
- The location plan showed that the plot was opposite 4 other plots, demonstrating the size of the space to be filled.
- The reference to the application in Ashwell approved on appeal was not relevant as this site did not meet the criteria outlined in the now adopted Local Plan. Ashwell and Kelshall were not comparable villages.
- The merit of the hedgerow to be removed is different to a domestic hedge. Whilst it was good to see it would be replaced, it would still represent a loss of a considerable hedge.
- This did not appear to be an infill site.
- One of the deciding factors on a previous application had been whether the site was a paddock or garden, Members needed a clear answer as to what represents infill.
- The use of the site is currently agricultural.
- The site was large and did not appear to be bound, with woodlands and shrubs, further fields, a footpath and agricultural buildings surrounding the plot.
- It was a big plot for one house and could not see how this could meet the infill criteria.

In response to points raised in the debate the Planning Officer and Acting Development and Conservation Manager advised there was no set definition of infill and each application was subjective and to be based on its own merit. It would depend on the land use of the existing plot and the relationship with the surrounding land. In this application the site had developments to the front and each side, albeit these were set slightly away.

Councillor Steve Jarvis proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that it would be detrimental to the character of the village and the street scene. This was seconded by Councillor Michael Muir and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That application 22/01229/FP be **REFUSED** planning permission due to the following reasons; the scheme is considered contrary to Local Plan policies that inform on appropriate development in Rural Area beyond the Green Belt. The proposal fails to comply with any of the criteria within Policies SP2 and CGB1 of the Local Plan, as the proposal is not

considered to fall within the remit of infill development given the sizable and spacious nature of the plot. Moreover, the scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the village and would be at odds with the sporadic pattern of development that makes up the settlement of Kelshall. The proposal is therefore deemed contrary to Policies SP2, D1 and CGB1 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 12 of the NPPF.

**50 TPO/00203 (2022) Church of St Peter, Pirton Road, Holwell, Hitchin, Hertfordshire, SG5 3SR**

*Audio recording – 63 minutes 51 seconds*

The Acting Development and Conservation Manager advised of the following updates:

- This application was for a Tree Protection Order (TPO) on a substantial tree.
- The draft TPO was served in September 2022 and following this a 28-day consultation period took place. If objections are received to the TPO in this time then it must be presented to the Committee.
- It was felt that the tree provided a positive contribution to the area.
- The TPO would not mean that no works can take place, but would be subject to a further TPO application.

The Acting Development and Conservation Manager presented the report in respect of application TPO/00203 (2022) supported by a visual presentation consisting of photographs and plans.

Councillor Michael Muir noted that this was a tree he had used on many occasions as a photographer and it would be a shame for this to be refused.

The Chair noted that this was a tree of public amenity and was very prominent in the area. It was in the ownership of the Church and she was supportive of the TPO.

Councillor Michael Muir proposed and Councillor Morgan Derbyshire seconded and, following a vote, it was:

**RESOLVED:** That the Tree Protection Order (TPO/00203) was **CONFIRMED**.

*Following the conclusion of this item there was a short comfort break in proceedings until 20.49.*

The meeting closed at 9.37 pm

Chair