

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

**MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES,
LETCWORTH GARDEN CITY, SG6 3JF
ON THURSDAY, 7TH AUGUST, 2025 AT 7.00 PM**

MINUTES

Present: *Councillors: Nigel Mason (Chair), Daniel Allen, Clare Billing, Val Bryant, Jon Clayden, Ian Mantle, Caroline McDonnell, Louise Peace, Martin Prescott and Dave Winstanley.*

In Attendance: *Amy Cantrill (Trainee Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), Robert Filby (Trainee Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), Shaun Greaves (Development and Conservation Manager), Andrew Hunter (Senior Planning Officer), Arhamna Jafri (Locum Planning Lawyer), James Lovegrove (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager) and Henry Thomas (Planning Officer).*

Also Present: *At the commencement of the meeting, approximately 4 members of the public, including registered speakers.*

Councillors Joe Graziano and Steven Patmore were also present as Member Advocates.

27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Audio recording – 1 minute 27 seconds

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ruth Brown, Emma Fernandes, Bryony May and Tom Tyson.

Having given due notice, Councillor Jon Clayden substituted for Councillor Brown and Councillor Daniel Allen substituted for Councillor Fernandes.

28 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

Audio recording – 1 minute 49 seconds

There was no other business notified.

29 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Audio recording – 1 minute 56 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 matters for the registered speakers.

(4) The Chair confirmed the procedure for moving to debate on an item.

(5) The Chair advised that Section 4.8.23(a) of the Constitution applied to the meeting.

(6) The Chair confirmed the cut off procedure should the meeting proceed at length.

30 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Audio recording – 4 minutes 49 seconds

The Chair confirmed that the registered speakers were in attendance and advised that Member Advocate, Councillor Joe Graziano, would arrive ahead of Agenda Item 6.

31 25/00872/FP 1 THE DRIVE, BLACKMORE END, ST ALBANS, HERTFORDSHIRE, AL4 8LE

Audio recording – 5 minutes 21 seconds

The Senior Planning Officer advised that there were no updated matters to report on since the publication of the agenda.

The Senior Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of application 25/00872/FP accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Val Bryant
- Councillor Louise Peace
- Councillor Dave Winstanley

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

- Trees within the site boundary were not covered by the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in the nearby area, however, the remaining trees in the south part of the site were proposed to be retained under a tree protection condition if permission was granted.
- The Highways Authority had raised no objection to the proposed access.
- Condition 7 within the report recommendations could be amended to include integrated bat, bird and bee bricks and hedgehog boxes as referenced by the Ecologist in their response to the application.
- Trees located in the north-east corner of the site would also be covered by the proposed tree condition if permission was granted.

The Chair invited the Public Objector, Kimpton Parish Councillor Simon Davies to speak against the application. Councillor Davies thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The self-build dwelling would be located on a busy and dangerous road.
- An appeal lodged against a decision to grant permission to a self-build dwelling on the adjoining site at number 51 Beech Way had been allowed and consequently, refused planning permission by the Secretary of State.
- Residents had contacted Kimpton Parish Council to express their concerns over the removal of trees on the site prior to development.
- The density of this application exceeded the density of the prevailing area in Kimpton Road, The Drive and Lime Avenue.
- This proposal appeared to be cramped given the size of the site, with limited amenity space compared to neighbouring properties.

- Creeping urbanisation resulting from infill development elsewhere in Blackmore End threatened to change the character of the rural community.
- Access was proposed to lead onto Kimpton Road where there were two adjacent bus stops and two busy road intersections.
- A mirror at the end of The Drive helped with access onto Kimpton Road but this provided limited visibility.
- Traffic analysis carried out by former Hertfordshire County Councillor Richard Thake in 2022 concluded that Kimpton Road suffered from excessive speeding.
- Kimpton Road suffered from frequent standing water problems due to ground water flooding.
- The proposed access situated between two junctions onto a busy and poorly maintained stretch of road had the potential to interfere with local infrastructure and presented a danger to bus and vehicle users, as well as pedestrians due to the absence of a footpath.
- They felt that this application and the application at 51 Beech Way had been treated unequally as the site sizes were similar before the removal of mature trees had taken place.
- There was intention from the occupiers of 51 Beech Way to resubmit an application for a smaller self-build dwelling on the adjoining site.
- If both applications were approved, there would be considerable cramping which would be out of character with the local environment.
- The Applicant for this site protested the application at 51 Beech Way.
- Since the mature trees had been removed from the site, owl activity in the area had reduced.
- Trees had a positive influence on the character of the area and their removal had undeniably impacted this.
- The trees that were felled were associated with the former Blackmore Manor.
- Their removal prior to submission may have been an attempt to prevent any tree protection requirements from being imposed on them.
- This proposed development failed to provide enhancements or be in keeping with an area that contained high quality buildings with amenable and sustainable spaces and did not reflect local policies.

In response to a point of clarification made by Councillor Daniel Allen, Parish Councillor Davies advised that they were unsure of the criteria used by former Councillor Richard Thake in their traffic analysis in 2022 which determined that traffic was busy during rush hour with an excessive number of vehicles speeding.

The Chair thanked Parish Councillor Davies for their presentation and invited the Member Advocate Objector, Councillor Steven Patmore to speak against the application. Councillor Patmore thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The development would be more cramped than neighbouring properties, lacked adequate amenable space and was unsympathetic to the prevailing character and setting of properties along Kimpton Road and The Drive.
- Despite the above, the development was well designed.
- Residents were concerned about vehicle access from the property as it was near two bus stops and an intersection with limited visibility, which would be hazardous to residents and bus users.
- Given the reasons described, the Committee should be advised to refuse the application.

In response to a point of clarification from Councillor Daniel Allen, Councillor Patmore advised that his definition of cramped would differ to the definition given by others and that he had already given his reasons for speaking against the application.

The Chair thanked Councillor Patmore for his presentation and invited the Agent to the Applicant, Mr Luke Kenton-Woods to speak in support of the application. Mr Kenton-Woods thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- They were both the Applicant Agent and the Architect for this application.
- Pre-application discussions with the Council confirmed that the application was likely to be approved subject to adjustments.
- Following advice received from the Council, enlargement of the site boundary took place as requested and all other comments on design, character, ecology, highways, living conditions, landscaping and more had been addressed.
- The proposed dwelling had been thoughtfully designed to complement its surroundings.
- The ridge height was lower than that of the existing dwelling on the site and the overall massing was modest.
- Inspired by the existing dwelling at 1 The Drive, the design featured brick detailing and projecting box bays and the rear elevation would adopt a contemporary style with large sliding doors which would give it the appearance of a historical property sympathetically extended over time.
- Sustainability had been central to the design with the inclusion of solar panels, air source heat pumps, mechanical ventilation with heat recovery, enhanced insulation and solar controlled glazing which would enable the application to exceed standards for low carbon living.
- Support for the application had been given by several third-party professionals, including ecologists, arboriculturists, highways consultants and energy assessors who had ensured a policy compliant scheme.
- No objections had been raised by many of the statutory consultees, including Ecology, Highways, Environmental Health and Waste and Recycling.
- Both national and local planning policy requirements were satisfied by the application, and a full set of planning conditions had already been agreed with the Senior Planning Officer.
- They were aware that Kimpton Parish Council had raised concerns regarding Highways. In response to those concerns, a Transport Statement had been submitted to demonstrate full compliance with local and national guidance.
- Visibility splays from the new entrance were policy compliant and would improve the visibility from the existing junction due to the proposed fence line adjustment.
- No concerns of over-development were raised during the pre-application discussions and the principle of development had been confirmed as acceptable.
- The proposed dwelling sat comfortably within the site and would have a rear garden of over 750 square metres which was well above the national required minimum.
- The proposed dwelling would respect the character of the area and would include high quality architecture from the vernacular buildings, although many were medium to large detached with no uniformity of design regardless.
- The trees removed on-site were legally felled by a qualified professional and not subject to a TPO or conservation area.
- An ecologist verified that no nesting birds or protected species were present in the trees when they were felled.
- New trees had already been planted by the Applicant despite no planning obligation to do this.
- The plans were deemed by the Area Development Highways Manager to be compliant with Highways policies.
- No issues had been raised on light, privacy or the overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- All relevant planning requirements had been met, and the application had been recommended for approval by the Senior Planning Officer.
- All statutory consultees either supported or raised no objection to the application.

- There were no material planning reasons to refuse the application and they urged the Committee to follow the officer recommendation and grant permission.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor Jon Clayden
- Councillor Val Bryant
- Councillor Daniel Allen
- Councillor Ian Mantle

In response to points of clarification, the Agent to the Applicant advised that:

- They could not confirm the discrepancies between reports on bird species found in the area, however, the arboriculturist was a qualified ecologist, and they confirmed that no birds were nesting in the trees that were felled.
- Tree felling took place in February or March.
- There would be sufficient parking and turning space available on the driveway.
- Access to the property was considered in an alternative place but was deemed to be impaired as it would be serviced by a mirror and they did not want to intensify an already bad access point.
- Their proposal improved the visibility from The Drive onto Kimpton Road by adjusting the fence line.
- There would be no gate to restrict manoeuvrability of cars onto the site and the parking spaces would be larger than the minimum 2.5 metre width requirement.
- If the application was amended to include integrated bat, bird and bee bricks and hedgehog boxes within the conditions, this would be accepted by the Applicant.
- Self-binding gravel around the property would make manoeuvrability for mobility scooters easy.
- There was no specific storage for mobility scooters within the design, but the property would have a good-sized utility room, snug and cloak room that could accommodate a scooter or pram.
- External cycle storage was also included within the application.
- An EV charging point was not shown on the plan, but they could provision this if a condition was secured.

In response to verbal presentations, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- The Highways Authority had not objected to the proposal and that carried significant weight in their recommendation to grant permission.
- The application only comprised one dwelling, therefore, the volume of traffic entering and leaving the site would be very small.
- The site at 51 Beech Way was half the size of this one and constrained by the TPO covering half its site, whereas this application would have more space between the property and site boundaries, making it comfortable within the site.
- The dwelling would compare favourably to surrounding houses on smaller plots in terms of density, especially to properties further north in Blackmore End.
- The dwelling footprint would be small and would fit the character of the area.

In response to verbal presentations, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- EV charging points were a requirement of Building Regulations, therefore, it was not necessary to require this through condition.
- An EV charging point would be free-standing next to the parking spaces or the Applicant would purchase long cables to link to a charging point situated on the dwelling itself. Both options should be easy to install.

In response to additional questions from Councillor Martin Prescott, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- Including solar panels and battery storage was not yet a planning requirement or Building Regulations requirement.
- Building Regulations required applications to meet a certain level of carbon emissions, and the Council adopted Sustainability SPD set out an accreditation for those who exceeded levels of sustainability.
- The main method of achieving a more sustainable dwelling was through insulation.
- Solar panels were encouraged but not a requirement.

The Chair proposed to grant permission with the amendment to condition 7 on integrated bird, bat and bee bricks and hedgehog boxes and this was seconded by Councillor Martin Prescott.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Louise Peace

The following points were made as part of the debate:

- The application met all the relevant criteria to be granted permission.
- There was a creeping increase in density in the area, but this was a normal modern-day issue and was not a reason to refuse planning permission.
- Cramped density compared to nearby dwellings was the biggest concern raised on the application, but dwellings further north on Kimpton Road were in close proximity to each other, therefore this argument was not valid.
- The application should be supported with the amendment to Condition 7 to include the wording used by the Ecologist in their comments on the application.

In response to points raised in the Debate, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that Condition 7 could be amended to allow the provision of integrated bird, bat and bee bricks with hedgehog boxes.

The Agent to the Applicant advised that the amended wording proposed for Condition 7 would be acceptable.

In response to a question from Councillor Caroline McDonnell, the Development and Conservation Manager confirmed that a self-build application meant that the Applicant would live in the dwelling once it was built.

In response to a question from Councillor Val Bryant, the Agent to the Applicant confirmed that the occupiers of 1 The Drive were building this property with the intention of moving into it once constructed.

Having been proposed and seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That 25/00872/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the reasons and conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, with an amendment to Condition 7, as follows:

Condition 7

All ecological measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the March 2025 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal as already submitted with the planning application, including integrated bird, bat and bee bricks and hedgehog boxes, and agreed with the local planning authority prior to commencement of the approved development, demonstrating that a biodiversity net gain can be achieved from those measures/works.

Reason: To ensure development is ecologically sensitive and secures biodiversity enhancements in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. To comply with Policy NE4 of the Local Plan.

32 25/00309/FP IVY'S COTTAGE, SMITHS END LANE, BARLEY, ROYSTON, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG8 8LH

Audio recording – 53 minutes 25 seconds

The Planning Officer advised that there were no updated matters to report on since the publication of the agenda.

The Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of application 25/00309/FP accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Jon Clayden
- Councillor Louise Peace

In response to questions, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- The main policy change since the previous scheme in 2022 was that the Council did not have a five-year housing land supply, therefore the tilted balance applied.
- The site conflicted with Policy CGB1 and Policy SP2 in the Local Plan as the application fell outside of the settlement boundary in Barley, but due to the absence of a five-year housing land supply, those policies were deemed to be out of date and the policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) were given greater weight than those in the Local Plan.
- Policies in the NPPF emphasised that dwellings should be located close to existing facilities within settlements, but not in isolated locations, therefore, a dwelling in this location was acceptable in principle.
- Improvements had been made to the design of the scheme since the previous application.
- The Conservation Officer, who had objected to the previous scheme did not object to this one as the significance of the impact on the conservation area was low compared with the previous scheme.

In response to questions, the Planning Officer advised that the balcony would be set into the roof and walled either side, therefore all views from it would be the same as those from a window.

The Chair invited the first Public Objector, Barley Parish Councillor Yvonne Lee to speak against the application. Councillor Lee thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- Two objections with detailed comments had been made by Barley Parish Council on the application.
- The scheme conflicted with Policy SP2 in the Local Plan as it was not within the settlement boundary of Barley in addition to Policy CGB1 as it did not meet any of the criteria for development in rural areas beyond the Green Belt.
- As it did not comply with key policies, it should be refused planning permission.
- The appeal decisions referenced in the report of the Planning Officer were materially different to this application as one was in Kelshall which was a Category B Village that complied with Policy CGB1, and neither were in a conservation area, making them irrelevant.
- Adopting a tilted balance in the absence of a five-year housing land supply was questionable as it meant that the policies in the NPPF overrode the policies in the Local Plan.
- The application also failed to meet key policies in the NPPF as it provided no affordable housing and the vitality of the rural community would not be maintained.
- Barley Parish Council were convinced that there were no mitigating factors in the application to justify granting permission.

The Chair thanked Parish Councillor Lee for their presentation and invited the second Public Objector, Mr Andrew Huzzey to speak against the application. Mr Huzzey thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The original application in 2022 was previously rejected by the Council.
- The application was contrary to approved planning policy in the Local Plan, particularly Policies SP2 and CBG1, and would cause harm to the conservation area and adjoining listed buildings.
- It was clear that the proposed dwelling would not enhance or preserve the surrounding area as it would impact its appearance and be extremely imposing.
- If the application was granted permission, there was concern over a precedent being set for homeowners with large gardens being able to build in their own boundaries despite living in a conservation area.
- The proposed development would be directly opposite their cottage and while the Applicant had reduced the rear height of the dwelling by half a metre, it would still be 8.8 metres higher than their property at the front which would reduce their main source of light from their front window and impact their right to light.
- The existing cluster of heritage assets made a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, whereas the height, fenestration and position of the proposed dwelling would contribute negatively.
- Serious consideration should be given by Members to the points that had been raised in their verbal presentations.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Mr Huzzey for their presentation and invited the Member Advocate Objector, Councillor Joe Graziano to speak against the application. Councillor Graziano thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- There were four comments of objection to this application on the Council website and three referencing the need for provision of swift boxes.
- Barley Parish Council resolved to object the application at a meeting in April.

- Barley had seen substantial development in recent years, both from infilled development and windfall sites and there were three sites in development presently in the village.
- The key issue was that the application was outside the settlement boundary but within a conservation area.
- Policy SP2 within the Local Plan identified Barley as a Category A village where development was allowed within settlement boundaries, but the application was well outside of these.
- Because of this, it was classified as rural land beyond the Green Belt, but it did not satisfy any of the criteria listed in Policy CGB1 of the Local Plan to grant planning permission on this type of land either.
- The Applicant referenced sustainable policies and self-build considerations in their application but given the development did not comply with key fundamental policies in the Local Plan, these were not relevant.
- The site lay within the conservation area and development inside these areas must preserve or enhance the character and make a positive contribution to the appearance by considering sighting, design, scale and use of materials.
- In his opinion, the development would erode the significance of the conservation area as the properties that fronted Smiths End Lane such as Blythe and South cottages opposite to the site and Ravello Rose Cottage adjacent to it were listed and made a valuable contribution to the setting of the conservation area.
- The verdant gap between Ivy's Cottage and Ravello Rose Cottage also contributed significantly to the setting of the conservation area.
- Built form on the site would be changed by the proposal.
- The proposed ridge height of 6.8 metres combined with the two-metre site elevation above properties opposite would cause demonstrable harm to all properties in this part of the conservation area.
- He agreed with Barley Parish Council in that there were no mitigating factors that would justify this application to be exempt from the planning framework in the Local Plan and recommended that the application should be refused.

In response to a point of clarification from Councillor Nigel Mason, Councillor Graziano advised that there was a population of swifts in the area which would be supported through swift boxes.

In response to verbal presentations, the Planning Officer advised that:

- This was a unique site on Smiths End Lane as it had a large garden and development on all three of its boundaries, making it an infill plot.
- Significant weight had been given to the assessment carried out by the Conservation Officer who had raised no objection to the application.
- An amendment had been made since the previous application to set the proposed dwelling further back to ensure that site lines of Ravello Rose Cottage and Ivy's Cottage would be retained when driving on Smiths End Lane.

In response to verbal presentations, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- The proposed dwelling would be to the north of Ravello Rose Cottage and would not cause overshadowing on this property.
- If Members considered that the development would cause harm to the setting of the listed buildings and to the character and appearance of the conservation area, this would constitute less than substantial harm to the conservation area and would have to be balanced against the public benefits arising from the development.
- The main public benefit would be the delivery of a dwelling to the Council housing stock in the absence of a five-year housing land supply.

The following Members asked additional questions:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Jon Clayden

In response to additional questions, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- In a heritage context, substantial harm was a high threshold as it only took place when heritage interest was removed from a heritage asset, for example, through the demolition of a listed building.
- Less than substantial harm was defined as anything less than this which meant that there was a broad spectrum within this category.
- Where there was less than substantial harm, the degree of this would have to be balanced against any public benefits, however, the Conservation Officer had deemed that there would be no harm to the setting of the nearby listed buildings or the character and appearance of the conservation area, therefore, assessing the balance with public benefits arising from the scheme would not be necessary.
- If Members considered there to be harm from the application in a heritage context, this would be less than substantial, and they would have to balance this with the public benefits of the application as mentioned previously.
- It was acknowledged that the proposed dwelling would affect the character and appearance of the conservation area, however, it would not do this in a harmful way.
- In their opinion, the insertion of a dwelling in a conservation area could not result in substantial harm to the heritage significance of a conservation area or to the architectural or historic interest of neighbouring listed buildings.
- For there to be substantial harm to those listed buildings, the Courts have found that a proposal would have to vitiate their architectural or historic interest, which would not be the case in this instance.

In response to additional questions, the Planning Officer advised that the height of the proposed dwelling would be greater than Ivy's Cottage but lower than that of Ravello Rose Cottage.

Councillor Nigel Mason proposed to grant permission and this was seconded by Councillor Clare Billing.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Jon Clayden
- Councillor Daniel Allen
- Councillor Caroline McDonnell
- Councillor Val Bryant

The following points were made as part of the debate:

- There were listed buildings surrounding the application site and it was outside the settlement boundary but within the conservation area.
- There were reasons to refuse this proposal that had been highlighted by the public speakers and careful consideration should be given to these.
- This application would interfere with an area that had seen no development for a long time, and officer assessment on harm in a heritage context had not taken into consideration the harm that residents would feel from this application.
- Given the lack of objection from the Conservation Officer and the policies within the NPPF, there was no clear reason to reject this application.

- It was positive that residents wanted to stay in the area and build a dwelling that suited their needs, but the objections to the application were sympathised with.
- An archaeological condition should be placed on the application.
- Upon a standard internet search on the conservation area within Barley, there was little historic interest here, however, they could request for a desktop survey to be carried out which would be the lowest form archaeological intervention.

In response to points made in the debate, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- The Hertfordshire County Council Archaeologist did not respond to the consultation which is why the application did not include an archaeological condition.
- If Members required a condition relating to archaeology, a standard condition would require a watching brief whereby an archaeologist would be appointed and paid to watch over the site while its foundations were excavated, however, there was no evidence to suggest that the site was of archaeological interest or that historical development had taken place in the nearby area, but this decision would be up to Members.

Councillor Martin Prescott proposed that delegated authority be granted to the Development and Conservation Manager to resolve whether the decision should be subject to a condition relating to archaeology in consultation with the Hertfordshire County Council Archaeologist.

Following a point raised by Councillor Martin Prescott, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that authority could be delegated to him to resolve any outstanding archaeological concerns, alongside the Hertfordshire County Council Archaeologist, and include any required conditions. This was accepted by Councillor Nigel Mason as the proposer.

Councillor Dave Winstanley proposed an amendment for an additional Condition 10 for the application to include integrated swift bricks and this was seconded by Councillor Jon Clayden.

Councillor Nigel Mason accepted the amendment into the substantive motion. This was also accepted by Councillor Clare Billing as seconder.

Having been proposed and seconded, and following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That 25/00309/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the reasons and conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager and the delegation of authority and additional Condition 10 as follows:

- (a) That delegated authority be granted to the Development and Conservation Manager to resolve whether the decision should be subject to a condition relating to archaeology in consultation with the Hertfordshire County Council Archaeologist, and
- (b) 'Condition 10

The dwelling hereby permitted shall incorporate integrated swift bricks which shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To enhance biodiversity in accordance with the aims of the NPPD and the North Hertfordshire Local Plan Policy NE4.'

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm

Chair