

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

**MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES,
LETCWORTH GARDEN CITY, SG6 3JF
ON THURSDAY, 23RD OCTOBER, 2025 AT 7.00 PM**

MINUTES

Present: *Councillors: Nigel Mason (Chair), Emma Fernandes (Vice-Chair), Clare Billing, Ruth Brown, Val Bryant, Ian Mantle, Caroline McDonnell, Louise Peace, Tom Tyson, Dave Winstanley, Steve Jarvis and Claire Strong.*

In Attendance: *Peter Bull (Project Officer), Faith Churchill (Democratic Services Apprentice), Ben Glover (Senior Planning Officer), Shaun Greaves (Development and Conservation Manager), Sarah Kasparian (Senior Planning Officer), Susan Le Dain (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), Edward Leigh (Senior Transport Policy Officer), James Lovegrove (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager) and Stephen Reid (Locum Planning Lawyer).*

Also Present: *At the commencement of the meeting approximately 38 members of the public, including registered speakers.*

Councillors Elizabeth Dennis, Daniel Wright-Mason, Tim Johnson and Matt Barnes were in attendance as Member Advocates.

70 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Audio recording – 1 minutes 27 seconds

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bryony May and Martin Prescott.

Having given due notice Councillor Steve Jarvis substituted for Councillor May and Councillor Claire Strong substituted for Councillor Prescott.

71 MINUTES - 18 SEPTEMBER 2025

Audio recording – 1 minute 52 seconds

Councillor Nigel Mason, as Chair, proposed and Councillor Ian Mantle seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 18 September be approved as a true record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chair.

72 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

Audio recording – 21 minutes 38 seconds

There was no other business notified.

73 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Audio recording – 2 minutes 42 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.

74 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Audio recording – 5 minutes 10 seconds

The Chair confirmed that the registered speakers were in attendance.

75 21/00765/OP LAND OFF BARKWAY ROAD AND NORTH OF FLINT HALL, BARKWAY ROAD, ROYSTON, HERTFORDSHIRE

Audio recording – 5 minutes 53 seconds

N.B. Councillor Ruth Brown declared an interest in this item due to her role as a Royston Town Councillor but confirmed that she had received a dispensation from the Monitoring Officer for this item only. She would therefore remain in the Council Chamber for consideration of this item.

N.B. Councillor Ruth Brown further declared that she was a Hertfordshire County Councillor, however following discussions with the Monitoring Officer previously, it was deemed that this was not an interest to prevent participation.

The Project Officer provided a verbal update on matters relating to Application 21/00765/OP and advised that:

- There had been a few additional matters set out in the addendum to the main report.
- An objection from Councillors Matt Barnes, Ruth Clifton and Tim Johnson was received in response to the re-consultation advice which had been omitted from the main report regarding technical matters and some general queries.
- The existing highways issues on Barkway Road were localised.
- The traffic survey held in December 2024 was deemed by the Highway Authority to be adequate.
- Traffic on Barkway Road was not free flowing at peak times, but the additional delays were not considered by the Highway Authority to have an impact on this.
- It could now be confirmed that Royston Town Council were not opposed to the routing of active travel through Green Walk Plantation.
- The published report and addendum set out potential additional highway mitigation measures.

- The Conservators of Therfield Heath and Greens had written a further letter withdrawing their request for mitigation and requesting that their application be refused in the absence of requested funding. This letter was available on public access system of the Council. If the Conservators did not accept the Section 106 contribution, the mitigation strategy would need to be amended.
- The addendum was an outline application with all matters reserved apart from the means of access.
- Members were considering an in-application Masterplan as part of the proposal, details of this were set out in informative part of the report.

N.B. Councillor Steve Jarvis entered the Chamber at 19:18.

The Chair confirmed with Councillor Steve Jarvis that as the item had been started, he would be unable to participate due to his late arrival.

The Project Officer then presented the report in respect of Application 21/00765/OP accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Louise Peace
- Councillor Claire Strong
- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Tom Tyson
- Councillor Val Bryant

In response to questions, the Senior Transport Policy Officer advised that:

- The Highways Objection in 2022 had been withdrawn because they were satisfied that the solution reached to change the red line boundary to reach Shrubbery Grove was in accordance with the Local Transport Plan.
- The additional traffic modelling had shown there was no impact to the junction but did not advise on the effect of traffic from Barkway Road.
- Conversion of the existing level crossing was proposed to improve the junction and to make it more accessible to pedestrians.

In response to a question from Councillor Claire Strong, the Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager advised that under the Planning Code of Good Practice, a Member could not take part in debate or vote at a meeting when they had not been present at the meeting when the item had previously been discussed. Therefore, as Councillor Strong was not present at the meeting on 4 September 2025, when the item was initially considered, she would be unable to participate in this item.

In response to questions, the Project Officer advised that:

- It was a matter for the Applicant and not the Highways Authority to build a cycle route through the Green Walk Plantation.
- The developers would be building the eastern phase of the development first and the cycle way would be part of the later western phase.
- The mitigation cost of £350 per dwelling had been adopted as a reasonable amount using advice in the mitigation strategy.
- Affordable housing did not currently require social rent.
- Discussions with Sport England following the meeting on 4 September had resulted in a reduction to the amount required from the developer towards the cricket pitch.

In response to questions, the Locum Planning Lawyer advised that covenants were not a material planning consideration.

The Chair invited the first Public Objector, Mr Richard Jameson to speak against the application. Mr Jameson thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The proposal to refuse this application had been deferred to allow the developer time to provide more evidence on traffic issues which they had failed to provide.
- The developer had still not provided evidence that this site was sustainable.
- The developer had not undertaken the proposed microsimulation for analysis due to the cost.
- There would be 197 cars leaving the site at peak times which was not sustainable.
- 98% of these 197 cars would drive down Barkway Road causing the traffic congestion to become severe.
- Hertfordshire County Council Highways Authority have recognised this but say it would only cause moderated harm to the area.
- The steep gradient of the hill remained unaddressed
- Would the committee accept the 450 plus objections from local residents who knew the area, or the word of the developer.
- This application contravened policies 5 and 6 of the Local Transport Plan.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Mr Jameson for his presentation and invited the second Public Objector, Mr Oliver Neaves to speak against the application. Mr Neaves thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- This application had been deferred to allow the Applicant time to provide further traffic modelling so Members could fully understand the situation.
- The committee was left without the requested and necessary information required to determine whether the impact would cause severe harm as detailed in paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Junction modelling showed that the traffic problems in Barkway Road and the A10 gyratory would still exist.
- Microsimulation software should have been used for an accurate assessment and was not expensive.
- The Strand 2 contribution was calculated using 2019 rates rather than index linked 2024 rates, which had resulted in the approximate £850K shortfall.
- The Applicant had failed to submit further modelling requested by the committee.
- The effect on highway network will be severe.
- This application failed to meet the requirements of the NPPF and should be refused under grounds of paragraphs 115d and 116 of the NPPF.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Mr Neaves for his verbal presentation and invited the third Public Objector, Ms Julie Dunthorne to speak against the application. Ms Dunthorne thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- This unallocated site was beyond the settlement boundary and fell to be judged against the NPPF having regard to the development plan.
- A critical issue was that the site was not in a sustainable location.
- The application conflicted with four broad policy areas of the Local Plan

- The site was inaccessible to key services and facilities by sustainable travel contrary to SP6B.
- The application failed to meet the threshold under SP9Ci and could not demonstrate transport systems were viable.
- GIS gradient mapping confirmed a 43-metre level change from the top of site to bottom of Barkway Road which was a gradient of 1 in 10 in parts.
- The section 106 contributions for Strand 2 Sustainable Transport were not compliant with policy SP7 sub paragraph C, which required refusal in such cases.
- Potential highways impact and safety risks were not accounted for contrary to paragraphs 115-118.
- Para 195 of the NPPF did not apply as the projects habitat had not been assessed.
- The adverse effects arising from cumulative impacts and with the loss of open countryside contrary to para 11D of the NPPF the application should be refused.

In answer to a point of clarification from Councillor Ruth Brown, Ms Dunthorne confirmed that under sub paragraph C of policy SP7 of the Local Plan, an application should be refused when section 106 contributions had not been met and there was a shortfall of £900K.

The Chair thanked Ms Dunthorne for her verbal presentation and invited the Member Advocate Objectors, Councillors Matt Barnes and Tim Johnson to speak against the application. Councillors Barnes and Johnson thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The technical note provided by the Applicant still failed to address the court issue with this development.
- No adequate modelling had been carried out on Barkway Road and adding 280 houses at the top of the hill would have a significant impact in this location.
- There was nothing in the updated documents that addressed the major problem of parked cars along Barkway Road and 98% of journeys would travel along this route.
- There was no evidence that an appropriate assessment on a habitat site had been carried out and considering the impact on Therfield Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) under Para 195 of the NPPF, the tilted balance should not be considered in this case.
- Impact on SSSI was a material consideration on this site and failure to mitigate the harm posed provided a reason for refusal.
- This application conflicted with the NPPF guidelines on sustainable travel.
- No agreement was recorded as being found for the Green Walk Plantation access on the west side of this development.
- Incorrect traffic modelling had been used for Barkway Road and the A10 gyratory system.
- The application was outside the Local Plan and should be refused.

Following a point of clarification from Councillor Ruth Brown, Councillor Matt Barnes advised that a tilted balance should not be considered when a plan was likely to have a significant effect on a habitat site unless an appropriate assessment was carried out as detailed in paragraph 195b of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The Chair thanked Councillors Barnes and Johnson for their verbal presentations and invited the Agents to the Applicant, Ms Katherine Else and Mr Chris Holdup to speak in support of the application. Ms Else and Mr Holdup thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- When this application was deferred in September Members asked for firm evidence on four key issues.
- These key issues were responded to in technical note 008 which was submitted on 15 September.

- Hertfordshire County Council Highway Authority carried out its own independent review and the final consultation response dated 3 October showed there was no new information that would affect the previous recommendation.
- The Highway Authority do not want to restrict the application subject to agreed £1.56million section 106 contributions.
- Sustainable transport connections were reviewed again in technical note 008 and it was confirmed that all the cycle and bus routes would enable residents to travel safely.
- Para 116 of NPPF was clear in that permission should only be refused on highway grounds if the harm impacts are severe which was not the case with this application.
- Every transport issue raised in September has been answered and verified.
- This scheme would deliver major investment and more sustainable travel for Royston.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Louise Peace

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

- Phasing of the development had been set out to follow the active travel route that would be provided by the Highways Authority, Hertfordshire County Council.
- The Applicant would be working with authorities to meet the requirements for an improved bus service.
- The Strand 2 contribution had been approved by Hertfordshire County Council.
- It was part of the planned works to provide a new footpath to Grange Bottom.
- The new cycle route through Greenway Plantation would be a benefit to the whole of Royston.

In response to points raised in the verbal presentations, the Senior Transport Officer advised that:

- The Strand 2 contribution amount quoted in the report would be subject to change as it was index linked.
- The Strand 2 contribution could be used at the discretion Hertfordshire County Council to secure the bus service on Barkway Road.
- Although it would be possible to access the bridleway where the two pieces of land crossed, this was a recreational route and not suitable for travel to work.
- The existing traffic problem on Barkway Road would not be considered a severe impact as detailed in paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

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

- The tilted balance was not disengaged by paragraph 195 of the National Planning Policy Framework for this application.
- Natural England were satisfied subject to a recreation strategy which was conditional.
- Prospects on appeal was not a material planning consideration. The National Planning Practice Guidance sets out advice on how planning authorities should consider costs on appeal.
- This cost regime encouraged local authorities to rely only on reasons for refusal which would stand up to scrutiny.
- The applicant would be entitled to appeal against the refusal of planning permission and make a cost application against the Council if it was considered that the Council had acted unreasonably.
- Members should only decide to vote against the advice from Officers in exceptional circumstances.

Councillor Nigel Mason proposed to grant permission, and this was seconded by Councillor Emma Fernandes.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Ian Mantle
- Councillor Louise Peace
- Councillor Val Bryant
- Councillor Tom Tyson
- Councillor Nigel Mason

Points raised during the debate included:

- This site was outside the Local Plan and outside the settlement boundary.
- Access would have to be by car making sustainable travel impossible.
- Sites must be able to be accessed by active travel routes.
- This did not meet the appropriate criteria for housing sites in North Herts.
- The titled balance was the only reason to support this application.
- There needed to be realistic planning reasons for rejecting this application.
- The requested traffic information following the last meeting had not been received and the data was still unreliable.
- Due to the shortage of housing, Members would have to demonstrate that the harm of this application outweighed the benefits to refuse the application.

Having been proposed and seconded and, following a vote, the motion to grant planning permission was LOST.

Councillor Ian Mantle proposed to refuse planning permission on the grounds that it was contrary to policy and that it was inadequate in provision of alternative means of access other than cars. Councillor Ruth Brown seconded this motion on the grounds that it was a site outside of the Local Plan and outside the settlement boundary.

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

RESOLVED: That application 21/00765/OP be **REFUSED** planning permission for the following reasons:

- a) The site, if developed, would fail to provide adequate opportunity for travel by residents and visitors by non-car transport modes and would therefore be contrary to paragraphs 110, 115 and 116 of the NPPF and adopted North Hertfordshire Local Plan policy SP9.
- b) The site was not an allocated housing site within the adopted North Hertfordshire Local Plan and was located outside the settlement boundary of Royston and within the rural area beyond the Green Belt. It was therefore in conflict with policies SP5 and CGB1 of the adopted North Hertfordshire Local Plan.

N.B. Following the conclusion of this item, there was a break in proceedings at 20.56 and the meeting reconvened at 21.07.

76 24/02780/RM LAND NORTH OF HIGHOVER FARM TO STOTFOLD ROAD, HIGHOVER WAY, HITCHIN, HERTFORDSHIRE

Audio recording – 2 hours 4 minutes 40 seconds

N.B. Councillor Nigel Mason declared an interest and left the Chamber and did not take place in the debate or vote. The Vice-Chair, Councillor Emma Fernandes, chaired the item.

The Senior Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters relating to Application 24/02780/RM and advised that:

- There were no further updates for Members.
- No objections had been received from the Highway Authority or the Lead Local Flood Authority (LFFA) on any detail of the plans.

The Senior Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of Application 24/02780/RM accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Ruth Brown

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

- The design of the road caused the carriageway narrowed from two lanes to one lane as illustrated in one of the slides in the presentation.
- The Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) would be attractive, with two ponds in the northern corner, one with a level of water and one without.
- The swales would be green and usable.

In response to questions the Senior Transport Officer advised that:

- This application was for groundworks, not for the infrastructure that would make the bus gate open.
- There was expectation that a camera would be installed in the spine road after correct procedure was followed and Hertfordshire County Council would have the power to enforce penalty charges for vehicles that passed through that were not buses.

The Chair invited the Public Objector, Mr Richard Wilcox to speak against the application. Mr Wilcox thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- At that Planning Committee held in July 2023 a decision was taken to defer this item to allow for more traffic data to be gathered.
- In September 2023 a weeklong traffic survey was carried out, but this data was not shared.
- In a transport note provided for the planning meeting councillors were given a report showing old data related from manual counts which indicated that traffic flows were in decline.
- Numerous reasons were given for why data was not provided, including that it wasn't ready and that traffic data wasn't material to the outline decision.
- The Department for Transport does have a count point on the Cambridge Road but the data was not from manual counts as it was estimated.

- The Department for Transport figures were robust and reported as national statistics, but traffic estimates for individual roads were less robust as they were not always based on up-to-date counts.
- The response received in August was specifically referenced to this Department for Transport data.
- Therefore, a decision was made to approve this application where traffic data had been falsely represented and other pertinent data had been withheld.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Mr Wilcox for his presentation and the Member Advocate Objectors, Councillors Elizabeth Dennis and Daniel Wright-Mason to speak against the application. Councillors Dennis and Wright-Mason thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- This was the first development of this scale in North Hertfordshire for decades.
- They were reflecting the concerns of the Walsworth residents which were most directly affected.
- It should be considered that the bus gate would only work if it was used by buses.
- Since the floods in September and November 2024 the flood risk evidence had been updated.
- In the interests of the public, the developer should provide a drop-in session for residents to keep them informed.
- The infrastructure of the main spine road and the facilities around it did amount to necessary highway and service infrastructure.
- The layout was a matter considered within reserved matters applications.
- The way the traffic routes in development were situated did include the main spine road.
- The bus route was essential to ensure that policies 3 – 10 of the local transport policies of Hertfordshire County Council were complied with.
- The Council needed to be critically aware of child safety in that part of the spine road.
- Condition 17 which in the outline permission, was discharged on 17 October based on the bus design.
- The inclusions of electrical ducts to detect number plates had not been taken forward by the Highways Authority.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Councillors Dennis and Wright-Mason for their verbal presentations and invited the Applicant's Representative, Mr Mark Osborn to speak in support of the application. Mr Osborn thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- This was the first phase of the development following approval of the outline permission in November 2024 for 700 new homes.
- The infrastructure in place was to provide a coordinated and sustainable solution.
- No objections had been received from all relevant authorities.
- The bus gate principles were agreed with Hertfordshire Country Council and had been cemented through the discharge of condition 17.
- The drainage strategy would channel water to the northern corner of the plot and this had been designed to accommodate 40% climate change.
- Foul drainage would disperse through a pumping station with timed discharge to the Anglian water network via Stotfold Road to the east.
- A public consultation was held in Hitchin in June 2025 where residents were updated on progress with the development.
- The developer had met with the Hitchin Forum in July 2025.

- A further detailed design reserved matters application would be submitted by the end of the month for phase 1 of the development, detailing the site and landscaping and open spaces.
- Details around the main public square had been delayed until later phases to work with Hertfordshire County Council to integrate the school design into this key space.
- This development would bring the much-needed new housing supply to the district with 40% of affordable housing.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor Emma Fernandes
- Councillor Claire Strong

In response to points of clarification, the Applicant's Agent advised that public consultations would be held in each phase of the development.

In response to a point of clarification, the Senior Transport Policy Officer advised that:

- There was a process that would have to be followed with bus route signage and if it was demonstrated that people were abusing the traffic order, then the Highways Authority could enforce a camera.
- The bus service was designed by Hertfordshire County Council as a new service which would stop on Stotfold Road before entering the site and it could turn around in the site.
- This would be a new bus service along the Stotfold Road which would expand to serve the whole of the site as it was built.

Councillor Emma Fernandes proposed to grant permission and this was seconded by Councillor Ian Mantle.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Ian Mantle
- Councillor Claire Strong
- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Val Bryant

Points raised during the debate included:

- This application had been accepted at the masterplan stage.
- This was one of the strategic sites in the Local Plan and needed to be moved forward.
- It would be beneficial to have the camera installed at the start of the project rather than at a later stage.
- There was already a bus service in place along the Stotfold Road.

In response to points raised during the debate, the Senior Transport Policy Officer advised that installation of a camera was a matter for the Highways Authority and not the Council. Highways were required to follow the correct procedure and demonstrate the need for a camera before one could be installed.

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

RESOLVED: That application 24/02780/RM be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager and the delegation of authority to the Development and Conservation Manager to update conditions and information with minor amendments as required.

N.B. Councillor Nigel Mason returned to the Chamber at 21:50.

77 25/02234/S73 LAND BETWEEN ROYSTON ROAD AND CAMBRIDGE ROAD, BARKWAY, HERTFORDSHIRE

Audio recording – 2 hours 50 minutes 40 seconds

The Senior Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters relating to Application 25/02234/S73 and advised that:

- The applicant had agreed to the pre commencement conditions.
- An amendment had been made to point a) to include legal mechanism wording.
- The additional condition 4 had been agreed by the Applicant.
- No objections had been received from the Highways Authority or from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LFFA).

The Senior Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of Application 25/02234/S73 accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Louise Peace
- Councillor Claire Strong

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

- The original condition 3 was restrictive and had therefore been amended to be in accordance with the details which formed the basis of the application.
- A Masterplan Compliance Statement would be submitted for condition 4 which would provide explanation of how it would accord with the masterplan and that any variation would require justification.
- The original masterplan was predicated from 2018.

In response to questions, the Local Planning Lawyer advised that:

- The original section 106 agreement did not include a Section 73 clause.
- It was critical to ensure that any amended condition was dealing with the legal mechanism to protect the original Section 106 agreements.

The Chair invited the Applicant's Representatives, Mr Andrew Hodgson and Ms Alice Kirkham to speak in support of the application. Mr Hodgson and Ms Kirkham thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- Mr Hodgson was a representative from Redrow homes.
- This Section 73 (S73) application followed the withdrawal of the previous S73 application.
- No changes were being made to the original plans.
- The new condition 4 was being imposed to comply with the masterplan document.
- Condition 20, from the 2018 agreement, related to surface water and a more appropriate solution had been prepared and agreed.
- Amendments in this application were to address the original restrictive wording of condition 3.
- The changes only related to the conditions amended and were not part of the scheme.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

Councillor Nigel Mason, as Chair, proposed to grant permission and this was seconded by Councillor Dave Winstanley and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That application 25/02234/S73 be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, amended as follows:

- a) The completion of a satisfactory Deed of Variation or other legal mechanism that secures the S106 obligations agreed as part of the Outline Application (18/01502/OP) and the applicant agreeing to extend the statutory period to complete it, if required.
- b) Delegation of power to the Development and Conservation Manager to:
 - (i) Resolve any outstanding matters,
 - (ii) Update conditions and informatives with minor amendments as required and,
 - (iii) Authorise the completion of other legal mechanism if not completed through a satisfactory Deed of Variation.

78 APPEALS

Audio recording – 3 hours 8 minutes 10 seconds

The Development and Conservation Manager presented the report entitled 'Planning Appeals' and advised that:

- There had been two appeals lodged.
- One appeal decision had been dismissed and the other one had been partly allowed in relation to the front access path.

The meeting closed at 10.12 pm

Chair