

**NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES,  
LETCWORTH GARDEN CITY, SG6 3JF  
ON THURSDAY, 12TH FEBRUARY, 2026 AT 7.00 PM**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** *Councillors: Nigel Mason (Chair), Clare Billing, Val Bryant, Ian Mantle, Caroline McDonnell, Louise Peace, Martin Prescott, Tom Tyson, Dave Winstanley, Tina Bhartwas (In place of Bryony May), Jon Clayden (In place of Ruth Brown) and Mick Debenham (In place of Emma Fernandes).*

**In Attendance:** *Sam Dicocco (Principal Planning Officer), Thomas Howe (Planning Officer), Susan Le Dain (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), James Lovegrove (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager) and Nazneen Roy (Locum Planning Lawyer).*

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

**122 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

*Audio recording – 1 minute 17 seconds*

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

Having given due notice, Councillor Tina Bhartwas substituted for Councillor May, Councillor Jon Clayden substituted for Councillor Brown and Councillor Mick Debenham substituted for Councillor Fernandes.

**123 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS**

*Audio recording – 1 minute 42 seconds*

There was no other business notified.

**124 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

*Audio recording – 1 minute 47 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.

**125 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

*Audio recording – 4 minutes 02 seconds*

The Chair confirmed that the registered speakers were in attendance.

**126 25/01094/FP LAND TO THE REAR 34, ARLESEY ROAD, ICKLEFORD, HITCHIN, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG5 3UU**

*Audio recording – 4 minutes 46 seconds*

*N.B. At the commencement of this Item, Councillor Louise Peace advised that she would be speaking as Member Advocate on both applications on the Agenda. She withdrew from the Committee and moved to the public gallery to speak at Member Advocate Objector.*

The Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters relating to application 25/01094/FP and advised that:

- The Conservation Officer had provided a response and confirmed it was not considered unacceptable in heritage terms.
- Herts Archaeology had provided a response and confirm that the conditions proposed could be removed.
- Updated plans, referenced as 01, 02 and 03, had been provided which detailed the location of the bin storage area and heat pumps.
- The Environment Agency had made a representation, which was available online, and had confirmed they had no objection. They confirmed that the sequential test could apply to this site, but having checked with Planning Policy team, this was applied during the allocation of the site within the adopted Local Plan.
- The applicant was in negotiations with Anglian Water to agree a solution, either on site or through any other connection possible.
- A resident had raised a concern with regards to the contents of their objection and how this would be covered by the Committee report. The matter raised were regarding issues already covered within the report and would not have changed the recommendation to grant.

The Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of application 25/01094/FP accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Jon Clayden
- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Tom Tyson
- Councillor Ian Mantle

In response to questions, the Planning Officer advised that:

- The Environment Agency had not recommended any conditions for inclusion.
- There was an error at 4.3.19 of the report, and references to the impacts of plot size, loss of light and dominance should be 'are considered to be acceptable'.
- The swale was controlled by the landowner.

- There were two conditions requiring a Construction Management Plan, one from Highways to address the deliveries and access routes to the site and one from Environmental Health to address mitigations to construction nuisance.
- The Ecologist had noted that there would be a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) shortage on site of 1.57, which was to be secured through off site credits and this was secured through the standards BNG condition.

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

- Conditions which required works to be completed would not be brought back to the Committee to consider, as details reserved by condition were delegated to Officers to determine.
- The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) had provided conditions for inclusion, therefore they do not believe further information was required at this stage to determine the application.
- When details on these conditions were submitted, the LLFA would be consulted again and, subject to their approval of the details, these would be approved.
- If the LLFA objected to the details provided, then these would be refused.
- Some details regarding surface water drainage were submitted with the application, but this was not always sufficient detail for the LLFA to approve without conditions.
- BNG was required to be provided as close as possible to the site

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

- No consultation had taken place with neighbours prior to the application being submitted.
- Concerns had been raised regarding parking, the felling of existing trees on site, the impact of construction and the flood risk.
- There were major concerns regarding road safety of the site, with access proposed from Duncott's Close, which was a 30MPH residential road with no footpath. The access would be on an existing turning head and therefore would create a blind spot.
- These issues had been identified by the Highways Authority in 2025.
- The increased traffic from this development would increase the probability of issues, with further development expected to the north of the site in the future.
- Safer access routes should be considered, such as access through the property owned by the applicant.
- The proposals for waste water do not consider the impact on the local community.
- Whilst there was capacity at the sewage works, there was not capacity within the pipe network and there was existing evidence of discharge from the sewers during periods of flooding.
- Without a robust strategy to address this, there would be health impacts on existing residents.

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

- The sites in Ickleford included in the Local Plan were only agreed after a decision by the government Inspector. Since approval of the Plan, circumstances had changes and windfall sites had been identified which meant not all allocations in the Local Plan were required.
- Ickleford was served by a Victorian sewage system which cannot deal with flood water runoff.

**Thursday, 12th February, 2026**

- This proposal had not considered water runoff adequately and proposals to use the River Hiz for runoff would increase risk of contamination.
- Whilst residents on Duncott's Close currently entered at a sensible speed, it would not be appropriate to increase use of this road, but this was the proposed access both during and after construction.
- The houses provided would be aimed at wealthier buyers and would not be readily available for local people.
- The Parish Council requested that all development around Ickleford, not just this application, be deferred until a suitable resolution to the sewage issue could be identified.

The Chair thanked Parish Councillor Crowe for their presentation and Councillor Louise Peace to speak against the application, as Member Advocate. Councillor Peace thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- There were three main reasons to refuse this application, which were sewage and drainage concerns, loss of biodiversity and overdevelopment.
- In relation to sewage issues, there had been an objection previously raised by Anglian Water. The existing system was old and needed investment, with evidence of sewage overflowing into gardens.
- The applicant suggested that infiltration would not be possible and would be required to be directed to the River Purwell, but proposals were to go into the River Hiz, which was an important chalk stream.
- The Ickleford Neighbourhood Plan policy was that developments should enhance the existing surroundings, which this development would not.
- A veteran poplar tree had already been felled on the site prior to the application. The North Herts Ecologist noted that this poplar could return if given sufficient space, not just the 1metre proposed.
- There would be a biodiversity loss of 31.13, which would not be beneficial to the community and was contrary to the Ickleford Neighbourhood Plan. BNG credit should not be purchased off site, when it could be delivered on site.
- The Local Plan outlines that applicants should assume for 60% larger homes and 40% smaller. However, this proposal was for 78% larger dwellings, with just 22% smaller.
- This proposal does not provide sufficient 1, 2 or 3 bedroom houses which was the most needed property, as supported by the Local Plan. This application had 4 dwellings with 4 or more rooms.
- The site had 23.7 dwellings per hectare, above the 20 dwellings per hectare outlined in the Design Code.
- Due to these reasons, the application should be rejected.

The Chair thanked Councillor Peace for their presentation and invited the Agent to the Applicant, Paul Watson to speak in support of the application. Mr Watson thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- This application would provide 9 family homes on a site allocated for development within the adopted Local Plan.
- The applicant had twice engaged with Planning Officers, in 2023 and 2024, and the proposal had been developed with their advice.
- The Officer report outlined that the appearance of the dwellings was suitable and took into account the requirements in the Ickleford Neighbourhood Plan.
- Access via Duncott's Close had been proposed in the adopted Local Plan and the Highways Authority had raised no objections.

**Thursday, 12th February, 2026**

- A sustainable drainage scheme had been submitted and mitigated for 1 in 100-year weather events, plus an additional 40% capacity. There would be SUDs provided on site, which would control run off, and there would be no increase in water runoff from the site than already existed. This had been assessed by the LLFA who had raised no objections, subject to conditions.
- Discussions were ongoing with Anglian Water regarding sewer connections, and it was considered that a suitable solution could be found. A connection could be provided, at cost to the applicant, south of Duncott's Close, if a solution on site could not be identified.
- No further work had been required following assessment by Herts Archaeology and the Conservation Officer.
- BNG would be delivered on site, where possible, as this was the cheapest and best way of delivery. However, on smaller sites achieving the required BNG was not always possible on site and therefore the conditions had been included to require this to be delivered off site.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor Jon Clayden
- Councillor Tom Tyson
- Councillor Martin Prescott

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

- Delivery of BNG onsite had been included following discussions with the Ecology Officer. However, some credits would need to be purchased to deliver the full BNG requirements. These credits had to be for a specific scheme, and this would be identified and outlined to Officers who would consider the appropriateness of this.
- The ongoing maintenance of the swale would be conducted by their clients, subject to planning permission being granted.
- It was likely that a connection to the Anglian Water sewage system would be possible from south of Duncott's Close. However, if this was not possible, an on site solution could be delivered, but this would be agreed with Officers.
- The fallback scheme if a mains sewer connection could not be achieved was a cargerster for the site. However, this has not yet been investigated in detail.

In response to points raised during the public presentations, the Planning Officer advised that:

- A condition had been proposed by Anglian Water, and agreed with the agent, which would be included in the final resolution.
- The third condition included by the LLFA was regarding the maintenance of the SUDs structures for the duration of the development.
- In discussions with the Environment Agency, it had been noted that it was the River Hiz, not the River Purwell.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Jon Clayden
- Councillor Tom Tyson

In response to questions, the Planning Officer advised that:

- The condition proposed by Anglian Water was an additional condition.
- A pre-commencement condition meant that the plans had to be submitted prior to works starting. A pre-occupancy condition meant it had to be delivered in line with these details.

**Thursday, 12th February, 2026**

- Details provided in response to conditions would be provided with the experts and consultees, and would only be approved and implemented with their agreement.
- The additional condition, relating to a foul water solution, specifically referenced the need to consult on plans with Anglian Water prior to approval of the condition.

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

- The Local Planning Authority should consider whether an unsuitable application could be made suitable through conditions.
- In this application, all consultees had confirmed that conditions could be applied to make it suitable. If Officers queried these conditions, it would be contrary to the comments of the consultees and, after 19 February 2026, the applicant could appeal for non-determination.
- It was not clear that the development was unacceptable with the conditions applied.
- The condition included for the Anglian Water connection provided for an on site solution, as well as consideration, if this was not possible, for 'any other solution'. To remove the 'any other solution' from the condition, Members would need to identify that this would cause demonstrable harm.
- Subject to the inclusion of the conditions outlined, with the additional condition, it was felt that the application addressed the requirements of the Local Plan to provide a suitable water plan.

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

- Officers had outlined that the development could be made acceptable with the inclusion of conditions, with details on these to be provided for Officer consideration, as outlined under the delegation of authority.
- A delegation to consult with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee could be included.
- The details provided in response to conditions would be discussed with the relevant consultees, including the LLFA.
- Concerns relating to a different connection point to the Anglian Water system could only be assessed once the plans were received.

Councillor Nigel Mason proposed to grant permission subject to the Conditions included in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, with the removal of Conditions 22 and 23, and new, additional Condition 22 as outlined by the Planning Officer. This was seconded by Councillor Ian Mantle.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Jon Clayden
- Councillor Ian Mantle
- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Val Bryant
- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Tina Bhartwas
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Tom Tyson

The following points were raised as part of the debate:

- Issues around the sewer connection to the site did not feel satisfactorily resolved.
- Members needed to trust the experts and the discussion did not advance the situation.
- This was an allocated site within the adopted Local Plan and Members would need a strong reason to oppose the scheme.

- The remained concerns about the biodiversity loss, the housing mix and the density of housing, but conditions were included and it was important to trust the experts in these matters.
- This was a delicate site, and a more sensitive approach could have been taken in order to mitigate potential issues with the development.
- There remained concerns regarding the chalk stream in the vicinity of the site and the drainage solution proposed.
- It was not about finding the ideal solution, as it was an allocated site within the Local Plan, but there were issues remaining with density, housing mix and the foul water solution.
- Members needed to consider the application being presented, not the potential for other applications which may come in the area.
- Overall, it was hard to find arguments against the site and the benefits outweighed the negatives. Details would need to be provided and would have to meet policy and legal requirements.

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

**RESOLVED:** That application 25/01094/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, with the removal of Conditions 22 and 23 and a new Condition 22 as follows:

'Condition 22

*No development shall commence until a strategic foul water strategy, or any other solution, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority, in consultation with Anglian Water. This strategy will identify a sustainable point of connection to the public foul network, or any other solution. Prior to occupation, the foul water drainage works must have been carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.*

*Reason: To protect water quality, prevent pollution and secure sustainable development having regard to paragraphs 7/8 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'*

*N.B. Following the conclusion of this item, there was a break in proceedings from 20.25 and the meeting reconvened at 20.32.*

**127 25/01790/FP LAND KNOWN AS THE ORCHARD, SNAILSWELL LANE, ICKLEFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG5 3TS**

*Audio recording – 1 hour 30 minutes 24 seconds*

The Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters relating to application 25/01790/FP and advised that:

- A response had been received from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and an additional condition had been proposed, as outlined in the supplementary document.
- Herts Archaeology had made representation and advised that they had no comments to make.
- An additional Condition 16 had been proposed by Environmental Health relating to actions to be taken if contamination is identified during works.
- There was a discrepancy identified on the mapping system, which had the neighbouring property labelled in the wrong position and with the incorrect spelling. However, the submitted plans were correct.

The Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of application 25/01790/FP accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Val Bryant
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Jon Clayden

In response to questions, the Planning Officer advised that:

- A BOAT was a 'byway open to all traffic' and was the responsibility of Herts County Council Right of Way, rather than Highways.
- The site was originally considered as not being inappropriate development in the greenbelt, but it was subsequently assessed to comprise development on greybelt land, as described in the submitted planning statement. Officers agreed with this assessment and there were no strong reasons for refusal of the application.
- The site was considered as limited infill within an existing village.
- As a greybelt assessment had been made alongside the infill consideration, it was prudent to assess both aspects.

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

- The BOAT would be maintained by Herts County Council as the relevant authority.
- Whilst the wider parcel of land to the north would be considered greenbelt, the site was considered as greybelt as it did not move the boundary further north than already existing properties.

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

- There were three main concerns with this application, these were the highways issues, the character of the development and the loss of landscape.
- The site would be accessed by a BOAT, which was essentially a rural track, not up to the standard of normal highways.
- The proposal is to encourage sustainable transport, but cycling to the site was extremely challenging.
- The room sizes on the plans would suggest a fourth bedroom could be created, which would further increase traffic movements and the BOAT was not safe or suitable for access.
- The lane was rural in nature and allowing this infill would suburbanise the character of the lane and would establish a principle of development.
- An apple tree on the site had already been removed and this loss of landscape was contrary to policies of the Local Plan.

The Chair thanked Mr Laws for their presentation and invited the second Public Objector, Ms Linda Eaton to speak against the application. Ms Eaton thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- This development would have a lasting impact on the existing family home due to the proximity and scale of the proposed dwelling.
- The site prevents the crawl of properties on the lane and ensures open space.
- It was proposed as a 3-bedroom house, but the size and layout included on the plans could lead to a 4-bedroom home, which would increase movements to and from the site.
- The height and bulk proposed would be imposing to existing surroundings and the first floor window would overlook the existing property, Glenmore.

- There were serious concerns about the access, with the lane already constrained and in poor condition. Construction traffic would make this situation worse and would cause potential obstruction to existing properties for both regular and emergency access.

In response to a point of clarification from Councillor Tom Tyson, Ms Eaton advised that the bungalow opposite the site, Glenmore, was one storey. The proposed first floor windows of the new dwelling would look directly into the bedroom and dining room.

The Chair thanked Ms Eaton for their presentation and invited the third Public Objector, Parish Councillor Phillip Crowe, to speak against the application. Parish Councillor Crowe thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The Parish Council had submitted a concise and detailed report in objection to this application.
- The lane represented one of the last rural parts of Ickleford and was part of the greenbelt.
- The size and character of the proposed development would impact on the existing area, with bungalows along most of the lane, with 4 houses along it, which existed for historic reasons.
- The entry access was not suitable, and the BOAT was primarily focussed on walkers and horse riders.
- Ditches were already filled during rainy periods and this flowed into the River Hiz.
- There were existing drainage issues in the area with the system unable to serve the lane adequately. Anglian Water were aware, as sewage incidents had occurred in this area.
- Natural habitat, including a 35 year old hedgerow, would have to be destroyed.
- There was a requirement on the Planning Authority to ensure no loss of biodiversity and that this should be enhanced through development, but without protections this was not possible.

The Chair thanked Parish Councillor Crowe for their presentation and Councillor Louise Peace to speak against the application, as Member Advocate. Councillor Peace thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- This application should be considered as an application for a 4-bedroom house in a rural area, which would make it inappropriate development in the greenbelt and was contrary to policies of the Local Plan and Ickleford Neighbourhood Plan.
- Whilst the proposal was for a 3-bedroom dwelling, the size proposed would allow for 4 bedrooms.
- The site was not within the defined settlement of Ickleford, therefore should not be considered infill.
- The level of development in Ickleford meant that policies of the Local Plan were being contravened.
- The National Planning Policy Framework outlined that safe and sustainable access was required for all users on developments.
- Herts County Council Right of Way team define the lane as a highway, but only for the same level of use as footpaths or bridleways, and it was not in a suitable condition to support higher levels of usage by car.
- There was a 500m walk to the nearest bus stop, with a bus that did not provide access to Letchworth or Hitchin stations.
- The site does not fit the existing street scene, as it was too great in height, and was in conflict with the Ickleford Neighbourhood Plan.
- Existing residents had already suffered from issues with sewerage overflow.
- The application should be refused as the site was not sustainable, the height proposed was too high compared to existing dwellings and it would have an unacceptable impact on neighbours.

**Thursday, 12th February, 2026**

- The application was not subject to biodiversity net gain requirements, as it was a self-build property.
- A condition should be included, if permission granted, to require the dwelling be used as the main dwelling for the applicant for 3 years.

In response to a point of clarification from Councillor Val Bryant, Councillor Peace advised that there were busses from nearby the site, but these did not provide access to the closest train stations in Hitchin or Letchworth.

The Chair thanked Councillor Peace for their presentation.

In response to points raised during the public presentations, the Planning Officer advised that:

- An ecological enhancement condition had been recommended by the Ecologist and was the standard condition in line with Local Plan policies.
- The internal space indicated on the plans would meet standards for a fourth bedroom. However, the parking provision requirement would remain as 2 off-street spaces.

In response to points raised during the public presentations, the Principal Planning Officer advised that:

- A condition requiring the applicant to live at the property for 3 years would not meet the test of necessity.
- The application was for the erection of 1 self-build dwelling, therefore there was no requirement to add further conditions on the self-build element. If it was found not to meet the self-build requirements, then it would be liable for enforcement action.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Jon Clayden

In response to questions, the Planning Officer advised that:

- The condition of the BOAT was discussed with the Rights of Way team. However, works requiring resurfacing could not be forced on the developer.
- The road would be maintained to a byway standard, but there were currently no plans to increase the level of maintenance of the BOAT.
- It would be for the County Council Rights of Way team to maintain the standard of the BOAT.

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

- The reference to 3 years of occupation was in relation to Community Infrastructure Levy payments and was therefore not relevant to a self-build.
- A representation had been made on the application by the Right of Way team, not Highways.
- Requiring the developer to complete unspecified works on land managed by the Highways Authority would not be reasonable to condition.
- Condition 5 had been included following consultation with Highways and there had not previously been issues with enforcement of this condition.

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

- The Committee needed to consider the application being presented and the information provided by Officers when coming to a decision.
- Conditions were required to meet six tests, of which necessity and enforceability are two of these, which would not be met with a condition imposed on a potential fourth bedroom.
- Imposing a condition to require the developer to conduct work to bring the BOAT to a higher standard would be unreasonable, as the BOAT was not in control of the applicant, nor was the applicant the sole user of this lane.
- Condition 5 required the applicant to submit a Construction Method Statement for approval by Officers. The works would then have to be carried out in line with this plan, otherwise enforcement action could be taken.

Councillor Nigel Mason proposed to grant permission subject to the Conditions included in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, with the addition of Condition 15, as outlined in the Supplementary Document, and Condition 16, as outlined by the Planning Officer. This was seconded by Councillor Clare Billing.

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

**RESOLVED:** That application 25/01790/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, with additional Conditions 15 and 16 as follows:

Condition 15

*Construction shall not begin until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme must prioritise the use of source control Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in consideration of the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and demonstrate no increase in flood risk as a result of the Proposed Development with sufficient supporting evidence provided to support its viability including supporting calculations for the 100% AEP (1 in 1 year), 3.33% AEP (1 in 30 year), 3.33% AEP (1 in 30 year) plus climate change, the 1% AEP (1 in 100 year) and the 1% AEP (1 in 100) plus climate change critical storms. Infiltration testing shall be carried out to inform the detailed drainage design; if infiltration is not viable, a detailed drainage strategy based on discharging to the ordinary watercourse south of Snailswell Lane at the greenfield runoff rate shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.*

*Reason: To ensure the flood risk is adequately addressed and not increased in accordance with NPPF and Policies of North Hertfordshire District Council.*

Condition 16

*In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it shall be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment shall then be undertaken by a competent person, in accordance with BS10175:2011. A written report of the findings should be forwarded for approval to the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of remedial measures a verification report shall be prepared that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out. No part of the development should be occupied until all remedial and validation works are approved in writing.*

*Reason: To protect human health and to ensure that no future investigation is required under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.'*

*N.B. Following the conclusion of this item, there was a break in proceedings from 21.30 and the meeting reconvened at 21.33, at which point Councillor Louise Peace returned to the Committee.*

**128 PLANNING APPEALS**

*Audio recording – 2 hours 30 minutes 54 seconds*

The Principle Planning Officer provided an update on Planning Appeals and highlighted that:

- An appeal had been allowed at Ickleford Primary School for the installation of a bike shed, with the Inspector concluding that there was a neutral impact on the Conservation Area.
- An appeal had been dismissed for a retrospective application for a box dormer extension at a property in Graveley, with the Inspector concluding that there was sufficient harm to the character and appearance of the area.

In response to a question from Councillor Tom Tyson, the Principle Planning Officer advised that it would be for the Enforcement team to consider the next steps relating to the box dormer extension, but action could potentially require restoration to the original condition.

The meeting closed at 9.35 pm

Chair