

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

DATE: 22 July 2021

PLANNING APPEALS DECISION

APPELLANT	DESCRIPTION	SITE ADDRESS	REFERENCE	APPEAL DECISION	COMMITTEE/ DELEGATED	COMMENTS
MBNL (EE & H3G)	Installation of 20M high monopole supporting 12 no antenna apertures including ground-based equipment cabinets following removal of existing 15M monopole.	Land Adjacent To Ashfield Drive Blackhorse Road Letchworth Garden City	19/02678/FP	Appeal Allowed on 18 May 2021	Delegated	The Inspector concluded that there would be conflict with emerging policies of Local Plan and the Local Plan taken as whole, and the design policies of the Framework. However, the presumption in favour of sustainable development under the Framework would apply. Given the harm to the character and appearance of the area would be small, planning permission should be granted due to this presumption. There are no other material considerations to outweigh this finding.
Linden Wates (Royston) LLP and Frontier Estates (Dartford...	Erection of a 73-bed care home (within Class C2), parking, access, landscaping and other associated works (as amended by plans received 11 November 2019)	Land West Of Royston Bypass Royston	19/00248/FP	Appeal Allowed on 11 June 2021	Committee	The Inspector stated that whilst he did not find a conflict between the proposed scheme in respect of social cohesion and the Council's adopted policy there is a some conflict with the emerging policies D1(Sustainable Design) and HS4 (Supported, sheltered and older persons housing) of the Submission Local Plan 2011-2031 which require new development to be well served by public transport with good access to services. With respect to character and appearance of the proposal, the

						<p>Inspector concluded that there is no conflict with Policies 6 (Rural Area beyond the Greenbelt) and 57 (Residential Guidelines and Standards) of the Local Plan. Furthermore, he concluded that there is no conflict with the emerging policies HS1 (Local Housing Allocations) and D1 (Sustainable Design) of the emerging local plan.</p> <p>The Inspector stated that the appeal is accompanied by a completed Unilateral Undertaking which includes financial contributions towards highway works and sustainable transport required to address the Council's third reason for refusal (Infrastructure). In its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) compliance statement, the Council has accepted that these obligations are in line with both Policy 57 (Residential Guidelines and Standards) and the emerging Policy HS2 (Affordable housing) and County wide policies.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--