

Public Document Pack

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD IN THE SPIRELLA BALLROOM,
ICKNIELD WAY, LETCHWORTH GARDEN CITY
ON WEDNESDAY, 17 JANUARY, 2018 AT 7.30 PM

MINUTES

Present: *Councillors Councillor David Barnard (Chairman), (Vice-Chairman), John Bishop, John Booth, Paul Clark, Bill Davidson, Jean Green, Cathryn Henry, Tony Hunter, Ian Mantle, Mike Rice, Adrian Smith, Harry Spencer-Smith, Martin Stears-Handscorn and Val Shanley (In place of Michael Muir)*

In Attendance:

Richard Tiffin (Area Planning Officer), Tom Rea (Area Planning Officer), Kate Poyser (Senior Planning Officer), Naomi Reynard (Senior Planning Officer), Nurainatta Katevu (Planning Lawyer), Hilary Dineen (Committee and Member Services Officer) and Amelia McInally (Committee and Member Services Officer)

Also Present:

At the commencement of the meeting approximately 91 members of the public, including 10 registered speakers and 1 Member Advocate (Councillor Sarah Dingley).

103 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Fiona Hill and Michael Muir.

Having given due notice Councillor Val Shanley advised that he was substituting for Councillor Muir.

Councillor Martin Stears-Handscorn had apologised that he may arrive late for the meeting.

104 MINUTES - 14 DECEMBER 2017

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Control Committee held on 14 December 2017 be approved as a true record of the proceedings and signed by the Chairman.

105 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

106 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (1) The Chairman welcomes the Committee, officers, general public and speakers to this Planning Control Committee Meeting;
- (2) The Chairman announced that Members of the public and the press may use their devices to film/photograph, or make a sound recording of the meeting, but he asked them to not use flash and to disable any beeps or other sound notifications that emitted from their devices;

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

- (3) The Chairman reminded Members and speakers that in line with Council policy, this meeting would be audio recorded;
- (4) The Chairman advised that Members would be using hand held microphones and asked they wait until they had been handed a microphone before starting to speak;
- (5) The Chairman requested that all Members, officers and speakers announce their names before speaking;
- (6) The Chairman clarified that each group of speakers would have a maximum of 5 minutes. The bell would sound after 4 1/2 minutes as a warning, and then again at 5 minutes to signal that the presentation must cease; and
- (7) Members were reminded that any declarations of interest in respect of any business set out in the agenda should be declared as either a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or Declarable Interest and were required to notify the Chairman of the nature of any interest declared at the commencement of the relevant item on the agenda. Members declaring a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest must withdraw from the meeting for the duration of the item. Members declaring a Declarable Interest which required they leave the room under Paragraph 7.4 of the Code of Conduct, could speak on the item, but must leave the room before the debate and vote.

107 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Chairman confirmed that the 10 registered speakers and 2 Member Advocates (Councillors Dingley and Hunter) were present.

108 16/00378/1 - LAND WEST OF ROYSTON & NORTH OF BALDOCK ROAD, ROYSTON, SG8 9NT

Outline planning application (all matters reserved except for access) for residential development of up to 279 dwellings and serviced land for a primary school with vehicular access; on-site 'Green Infrastructure' provision; pedestrian and cycle links; public open space; play area; car parking; drainage; landscaping; electrical sub-station and, ancillary works (as amended by plans and documents received on 8.7.2016; 24.10.16; 10.02.17 and 18.09.2017).

Prior to commencement of the item Councillor Tony Hunter declared a Declareable Interest in that he had previously spoken on a number of occasions against any further development of this site. He advised that he would withdraw from the Committee and take no part in the debate and vote. He would however act as a Member Advocate, speaking in objection to the application, after which he would leave the room for the remainder of the item

Councillor Hunter left the body of the Committee and joined the registered speakers.

The Area Planning Officer (RT) advised Members that there were a number of updates to the report as follows:

Condition 10

Condition 10, as per the report stated that Traffic Regulation Orders must be secured prior to commencement of development.

The applicant had requested that the Highway Authority consider relaxing this trigger to occupation of the development.

Following late in the day discussions, the Highway Authority had agreed a compromise such that the completion of slab level was the relevant trigger for the implementation of the TROs.

Condition 10 had therefore been amended to read:

Prior to the commencement of above ground works of the development hereby approved any Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that may be required as part of improving the accessibility of the site must be secured in place, such as the likelihood of implementing the relocation of the 40 mph speed restriction signs along Baldock Road which shall be subject to the Speed Management Strategy criteria.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, amenity and free and safe flow of traffic.

Condition 18

The standard archaeological condition should be added as Condition 18 to read:

- A. No development shall take place/commence until an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of archaeological significance and research questions; and:
1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
 2. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording as required by the archaeological evaluation;
 3. The programme for post investigation assessment;
 4. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
 5. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 6. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 7. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.
- B The development shall take place/commence in accordance with the programme of archaeological works set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).
- C The development shall not be occupied/used until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis and publication where appropriate.

Reason: To safeguard the archaeological record.

The Area Planning Officer advised that there were several corrections to the report as follows:

Paragraph 3.7

The first sentence to read:

HCC Obligations – Has requested scaled contributions towards library services and the provision of a new school on serviced land provided by the developer as set out in the table below.

Paragraph 3.12

The sentence regarding Air Quality to read:

Recommend imposition of condition to require EV charging and travel plan at the reserved matters stage.

Paragraph 4.3.17

The last sentence to read:

Similarly, any detailed landscaping scheme must specify a meaningful and well designed circular walk such that will attract regular use by the incoming residents, particularly dog walkers.

Paragraph 4.3.24

The first sentence to read:

This scheme will deliver 35% affordable housing, a site for a new first school together with scaled funds towards its construction and contributions toward secondary education and library services in the town.

Paragraph 4.5.1

The third sentence to read:

However, if it is not completed in time (by the 30 March 2018 or any later date agreed between the parties) I would also recommend that this committee further resolve that officers be able to refuse planning permission (under delegated powers) on the grounds of no satisfactory agreement such that would be necessary to mitigate the effects of the development,

Paragraph 6.0

That the recommendation be amended to read:

That the committee **RESOLVE TO GRANT** planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory section 106 agreement and the conditions set out below.

If the section 106 agreement is not completed by the 30 March 2018 (or any later date agreed with officers) the Committee further **RESOLVE TO REFUSE** permission on the grounds of no satisfactory section 106 agreement such that would be necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development.

The Area Planning Officer presented the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, supported by a visual presentation consisting of plans, drawings and photographs of the site.

Councillor Tony Hunter Member Advocate, thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 16/00378/1.

Councillor Hunter Informed Members that he had a long history of talking against this development and that he was, on this occasion, also acting on behalf of the two ward Councillors Hill and Dingley.

The Ward Councillors have for a long time had an argument about sustainable development. The Government, the NPPF and the Office of National Statistics had made this argument very difficult as each time the housing numbers in an area increased, the bar for sustainability was lowered.

He was fully aware that there was a possibility that this development would be granted, but there were a number of aspects that Members should be made aware of.

Sewage

NHDC had been assured that the existing sewage system was capable of coping with sewage from the original Keir development without any problems.

For the last two years local residents had lived with a smell arising on a regular basis.

Anglian Water were aware of the problem and had been working very hard to solve it, but they were unable to gain access to the pumping station as they have to be invited in and the developer has to invite them to adopt the system.

This new development should not commence until the sewage and foul water system is sorted.

The current system joined onto an old system that was totally unsatisfactory and caused the residents to live in a situation that was unacceptable.

Health Informative

Hertfordshire County Council dictates where Section 106 funding should be directed, however in the case of health provision this should be more flexible,

There was talk about the Health Centre being moved and if Section 106 was allocated to one particular building or organisation and the Health Centre did move the end result could be a loss of provision in the town.

Railway

Councillor Hunter acknowledged that this was reserved matters, however it should be noted that this development was next to a railway line.

A lot of thought should be given, when the reserved matters are considered, to the requirement for a fence along the railway edge of the development, secure enough to keep the public and children off the railway line.

Highways

Putting cars out into the middle of the Baldock Road was not the best way to deal with access in and out of a large estate.

Councillor Hunter advised that, in his opinion this should be dealt with by using roundabouts to prevent the possibility of cars being stranded in the middle of this busy road.

Environment

Historic England had put a very good case that this development did not conserve or enhance the natural environment as far as the Heath is concerned.

Members asked for clarification regarding the comments made about cars in the middle of the road.

Councillor Hunter stated that the plan was to have access onto the Baldock Road, with a refuge in the middle of the road. He believed that this was not a good idea and that roundabouts were safer and would provide a better flow of traffic.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Hunter for his presentation.

Councillor Hunter left the room for the remaining duration of the item.

Wing Commander Alan Greenbank thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 16/00378/1.

Wing Commander Greenbank advised Members that it was accepted that development would go ahead but trusted that the Committee would listen carefully to the extremely valid concerns of residents and take their views into account when making their decisions.

Sewage

The main area of concern was regarding the existing issues with the foul water drainage and sewage disposal system.

The existing Ivy Lane and Rosecombe developments had a sewage pumping station which fed into the Baldock Road sewer and McDonald's had a separate pumping station which also fed into this sewer.

It should be noted that the Baldock Road sewer originally only serviced the Heath Sports Club and was sized accordingly. Heathfield was on septic drainage. This sewer then connected to the sewer running down Mackerel Hall.

Residents of the Ivy Lane and Rosecombe developments and the wider community along Baldock Road and in Heathfield, Mackerel Hall, Downlands and Cedar Crescent were currently subjected to foul stinks from the existing sewers, which only varied in intensity, not in frequency.

Additionally there had been flooding of raw sewage onto Therfield Heath, since the two sites were connected.

Anglian Water had been trying to resolve the problem for more than 2 years without success and residents still live with an incessant smell along the Baldock Road despite efforts to make the system work.

The comments made by Anglian Water were provided at Paragraph 3.15 of the Officer's report and residents supported the comment that no property should be occupied until works have been completed in line with an agreed foul water strategy. However, it is the strategy that we have concerns over.

The mitigation method outlined in the Anglian Water addendum dated 23 December 2015, proposed a 103 m³ off-line storage tank to be built alongside Baldock Road below Therfield Heath.

The proposed location was within a Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) water extraction zone and above the main aquifer for Royston's drinking water. As such any overflow would be detrimental to the safety of Royston's water supply.

The Heath Conservators, the Environment Agency and Affinity Water would have to be consulted on any proposal.

It appeared that one source of the odour was from manhole vents on the Mackerel Hall sewer, another area of the stink was at the top of Ivy Lane.

Residents could not believe that a solution that channelled the sewage from an additional 279 homes, via the proposed mitigation tank into the same Baldock Road/Mackerel Hall sewer would resolve the problem of the foul smell.

The only solution, which would ensure that there was no stink, was a completely new sewer which did not flow into the existing Baldock Road/Mackerel Hall sewer.

This might be a connection to the Briary Lane sewer, as stated by Iain Amiss (Anglian Water Head of Development) at a recent meeting with Sir Oliver Heald MP, the Anglian Water CEO and local Councillors, via a direct connection to Royston's waste water treatment works or taken under the railway and connected to the mains sewer in the York Way area.

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

The existing Ivy Lane and McDonald's pumping stations should then be connected to this new sewer. However, please be aware that if these pumping stations cannot be connected to a new link to the treatment works, then the existing system for the current properties would still need a resolution.

The health and well-being of residents must take precedence over the need for housing and the financial benefit of the developer.

Road Safety

The second key issue of concern was regarding road safety on the Baldock Road.

The proposed extension of the 40mph limit was welcomed.

Paragraph 4.3.8 of the report stated that a road narrowing feature to calm traffic speeds should be included.

Residents considered that more than one feature would be required, with additional pinch points and other mitigation measures to ensure traffic conformed to the limit.

This was essential to slow traffic down, as the current 40mph limit was not adhered to in any form by traffic on the Baldock Road and more positive methods of control were required.

It was also proposed that a pedestrian/cycle link be provided between this site and the adjacent sites, for easier access to Royston station without having to go along the Baldock Road.

The Chairman thanked Wing Commander Greenbank for his presentation.

Mr David Bainbridge, Applicant's Agent, thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee in support of supplication 16/00378/1.

Mr Bainbridge thanked officers for their professional handling of this application over a prolonged period of time.

He was pleased to note the recommendation to grant planning permission subject to planning conditions and Section 106 obligations.

There were no technical objections to the proposed development of housing and land for a first school, meaning that issues such as access, highways and foul drainage as well as ecology regarding the SSSI had been dealt with at this outline planning stage.

The report demonstrated, at Paragraph 4.4.2, that the proposed development was sustainable.

There was not a 5 year land supply for housing in the District and this site was identified in emerging policy RY/1. Mr Bainbridge asked that Members support that emerging policy within the emerging Local Plan.

This was an outline application and therefore there would be time needed for reserved matters, discharge of conditions and for further engagement with technical stakeholders prior to delivery of the homes and land for the school.

The development included a substantial area of green space within the site as well as a local area of play for children.

The Applicant had held discussions with Natural England and dealt with their concerns on respect of the Heath and proposed a significant financial contribution as a Section 106 Matter.

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

In terms of highways and access, they had met a number of times with Hertfordshire County Council's Highways Team. The access provision comprised of two T-junctions with a right hand turn lane as well as a Traffic Regulation Order to reduce the road speed limit. This would of course need enforcing, which no-one in this room was able to do, but the Police Authority would have the power to do this.

The report summarised the proposed planning obligations at Paragraph 4.3.24 and there was a fully drafted legal agreement that had been shared with officers at NHDC and HCC and there was very little to still to be agreed.

In respect of sewerage, they had commissioned Anglian Water to prepare a hydraulic model study which identified the constraints of the sewerage network, in particular the manhole which this foul sewerage would connect into.

The sewerage had to be pump fed and there is a financial contribution to be made as well as a further study. There was a planning condition which required a strategy to be brought forward, which would be consulted on and given scrutiny by officers, Anglian Water and any other stakeholder who wished to get involved. The agreed system would then have to be put in place prior to the first occupation.

In respect of the health provision, the applicant was flexible regarding the vision for the health contribution and the applicant had agreed to the full amount requested by the NHS.

Mr Bainbridge concluded by asking Members to support the officer recommendations and resolve to approve the application, subject to planning conditions and planning obligations.

Members asked what the applicant's view would be if the sewerage report showed that a new sewer was required.

Mr Bainbridge advised that his client recognised that there was a financial requirement of the new development to make a contribution to any upgrade to the sewage network. A full report had been prepared by Anglian Water which included a fully costed strategy and the Water Industry Act apportioned costs onto the developer and the developer would pay those costs.

Members asked whether the developer would ensure that the fencing between the site and the railway line was secure.

Mr Bainbridge informed Members that they would fully expect that, as part of the reserved matters submission, there would be a strategy that would include a detailed plan regarding treatment for both the housing plots as well as the site itself. He would fully expect that boundary to be fenced to ensure that children could not wander onto the railway line or land.

The Chairman informed Members that he had taken advice and this could be the subject of a condition appended to the full application.

The Chairman thanked Mr Bainbridge for his presentation.

Members asked for clarification regarding the difficulties addressing the sewerage issue from the previous development and asked for an explanation of the problems around the adoption of the sewers and the requirement for Anglian Water to be invited to address these issues.

The Area Planning Officer advised that the precise mechanism for dealing with sewage from the development was not a matter for the Planning Authority, but was a matter for the statutory undertaker, which in this case was Anglian Water.

The Planning Authority was dependent on the statutory body's professional input and Anglian Water's professional input was Condition 15.

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

The Planning Authority could, however make sure that all statutory bodies have been consulted in the strategy required by Condition 15.

He therefore suggested that wording could be inserted in Condition 15 as follows:

That no development shall commence until the foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This strategy should evidence that all relevant statutory bodies have been consulted.

Members noted the current tree screen along the Baldock Road and, whilst acknowledging that this may be reserved matters, queried whether these trees would remain or, if removed, be replaced two for one.

The Area Planning Officer advised that the tree screen was well established and that it was a critical part of this scheme as it was an existing resource. Also Historic England had expressed concern that development on this site would have a negative impact on the monument and this screen played a critical role in softening the impact of residential development on that site.

When the reserved matters submission was received, landscaping, and in particular this tree screen would be central. The Area Planning Officer would expect to see this screen enhanced, deepened and managed in perpetuity for the impact on the view from the Heath. Members would have the opportunity to consider this when the reserved matters application was presented.

Members commented that the Baldock Road was already quite dangerous and difficult to negotiate regarding cars waiting to go into McDonalds and noted that as a result of this development there would be a lot of cars and a lot of service vehicles, which would make the proposed T-junctions very busy. They queried whether T-junctions would be inadequate to deal with these vehicles and asked whether Highways could be requested to consider roundabouts for these junctions.

The Area Planning Officer advised that Members should consider the scheme presented to them, which did not include roundabouts. He would not encourage Members to refuse planning permission on the basis of no roundabouts and if Members chose to do this, they would have to provide highways evidence to support their decision.

The access arrangements would be subject to a full safety audit, if when undertaking this audit the Highway Authority decided that roundabouts were preferable they would inform the Planning Authority, although it should be noted that a lot of work had already been undertaken regarding this and a change of decision was unlikely.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That application **16/00378/1** be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 agreement and the conditions as set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager and the amended and additional conditions below.

Amended Condition 10 to read:

Prior to the commencement of above ground works of the development hereby approved any Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that may be required as part of improving the accessibility of the site must be secured in place, such as the likelihood of implementing the relocation of the 40 mph speed restriction signs along Baldock Road which shall be subject to the Speed Management Strategy criteria.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, amenity and free and safe flow of traffic.

Amended Condition 15 to read:

No development shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This strategy should evidence that all relevant statutory bodies have been consulted. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding.

Additional Condition 18 to read:

- A. No development shall take place/commence until an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of archaeological significance and research questions; and:
1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
 2. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording as required by the archaeological evaluation;
 3. The programme for post investigation assessment;
 4. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
 5. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 6. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 7. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.
- B The development shall take place/commence in accordance with the programme of archaeological works set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).
- C The development shall not be occupied/used until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis and publication where appropriate.

Reason: To safeguard the archaeological record.

- (2) If the Section 106 agreement is not completed by 30 March 2018 (or any later date agreed with officers) application **16/00378/1** be **REFUSED** planning permission on the grounds of no satisfactory Section 106 agreement such that would be necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development..

Councillor Hunter returned to the Committee.

109 17/02470/1 - LAND ACROSS VERGES AT, ROYSTON BYPASS, ROYSTON

New roundabout and access from the A505 to serve residential development.

The Senior Planning Officer (NR) advised that there were a number of corrections and updates to the report as follows:

Corrections to the Report

The description on the agenda front pages should read:

New roundabout and access from the A505 to serve residential development.

The reason for referral to Committee should read:

This application is for operational development on a site under 1Ha. Therefore the application can be determined under delegated powers. However, officers are seeking a resolution from Members for the reasons set out on Paragraph 4.2.4 below.

Updates

Written confirmation had been received from the Highways Operations & Strategy Group Manager, Northern Herts, Hertfordshire County Council as follows:

“Reading the below I understand you require confirmation that HCC will be prepared to progress the Section 278 process on the basis of a committee resolution to grant permission.

I can confirm HCC Highways are happy to proceed with drawing checks and the preparation of a draft Section 278 highways agreement in relation to Application No.17/02470/1 but not to sign and seal the agreement until all reserved matters to outline conditional permission No.14/02485/1 are approved. I should of course point out that any work carried out, along with any associated fees, would be at the applicant’s risk should it turn out to be abortive work.”

Comments had also been received from the Senior Historic Environment Advisor, Archaeology as follows:

This proposal concerns the formation of a roundabout and access to a site which was the subject of planning application 14/02485/1 for residential development.

When commenting on that planning application this office recommended a programme of pre-determination archaeological investigations followed by further investigation by condition.

The results of both phases of archaeological investigation revealed heritage assets of low significance dating from the post-medieval period onwards.

In this instance therefore, we have no comment to make upon the proposal.”

Summary

- This was a slightly complex resolution therefore the explanation made in paragraph 4.2.4 of the report should be reiterated;
- The application was for operational development on an area of land below 1Ha, therefore, technically, the application could be determined under delegated authority;
- However, outline planning permission was granted in 2016 for residential development with all matters reserved, including access. Although access was discussed in detail at the outline application stage and it was agreed that it should be off the A505 not Newmarket Road;
- The reserved matters applications would be submitted in phases;
- A phasing plan had been approved;
- A reserved matters application had been submitted for Phase 1 for all matters including access. This application was under consideration and would be referred to Planning Control Committee in due course;
- It was not considered appropriate to determine this application for the roundabout and access under delegated powers as this could be seen to be predetermining Members decision on the reserved matters application;
- The Applicants had requested that this application for the roundabout be determined so that they could move forward with their Section 278 discussions with the Highways Authority;

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

- Whilst it was not considered appropriate for the application to be determined prior to the reserved matters application it had been agreed that this application be referred to the Planning Control Committee with a resolution to grant planning permission following any grant of planning permission for the reserved matters application for Phase 1;
- This application for the roundabout and access could then be determined under delegated authority immediately following the committee meeting where the reserved matters application is determined;
- We requested from the agent suitable written confirmation from Hertfordshire County Council Highways Authority to confirm that, should Members of the NHDC Planning Control Committee agree a resolution to grant planning permission, as set out in the recommendations paragraph 6.1 of the report (not a planning permission), that this would be sufficient for them to progress the Section 278 Agreement negotiations;
- This written confirmation had been received;
- The recommendation sets out to cover three possible scenarios.

The Senior Planning Officer recommended that Members resolve:

1. That planning permission be granted subject to conditions under delegated powers, following a grant of planning permission of application for reserved matters of Phase 1 of the development. This resolution is up to and including the period within which the reserved matters application for approval of reserved matters is being considered and determined.
2. That if the applicant does not extend the statutory expiry date to a date specified by the Local Planning Authority to allow time for the application for approval of reserved matters for Phase 1 to be determined then the application can be refused under delegated powers.
3. That if the application for reserved matters for Phase 1 is refused, that planning permission can be refused under delegated powers.

The Senior Planning Officer noted that paragraph 4.3.5 should be amended to 4.2.5 and after 4.9 all numbering should be corrected and renumbered accordingly.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, supported by a visual presentation consisting of plans, drawings and photographs of the site.

Mr John Baines, Applicant, had registered to speak in support of application 17/02470/1, however he had advised the Chainman that he was withdrawing this request.

Members asked for clarification regarding how residents of this estate would get into Royston town as it would appear from the layout that residents would have to drive a circular route, which would be contrary to policies regarding sustainability.

The Senior Planning Officer acknowledged that the access to the site was onto the A505, which was heading out of town.

The original plan was for the access to be onto the Newmarket Road, however the general consensus was that this was unacceptable as it would involve the loss of a lot of trees and a lot of ground works.

She advised that this had been the subject of some discussion at the outline stage. Whilst access was a reserved matter, it was agreed at the outline stage that an access onto the A505 would be acceptable.

Members asked for clarification regarding the relationship of the proposed roundabout with the A505.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the roundabout would be on the A505 itself. Councillor Hunter advised that he, along with Councillor Hill had been involved with the discussion with Highways on the original application and following a full safety audit, it was agreed that Newmarket Road and Garden Walk were not the right ways to access the site. A full roundabout on the A505 was agreed as the most suitable access.

Members commented that the comments of the Town Council, made on the initial application, should be considered when looking at the reserved matters application, regarding the speed issues of traffic travelling along the A505.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That, following a grant of planning permission of application for reserved matters of Phase 1 of the development, the Development and Conservation Manager be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission in respect of application **17/02470/1**, subject to the conditions and reasons contained in the report.
This resolution is valid for the period up to and including the period during which the reserved matters application for approval of reserved matters is being considered and determined.
- (2) That, if the applicant does not extend the statutory expiry date to a date specified by the Local Planning Authority to allow time for the application for approval of reserved matters for Phase 1 to be determined, then the Development and Conservation Manager be authorised to make a decision that in respect of application **17/02470/1** planning permission can be refused.
- (3) That, if the application for approval of reserved matters for Phase 1 is refused, the Development and Conservation Manager be authorised to make a decision in respect of application **17/02470/1** planning permission can be refused.

110 17/02482/1 - 2 GARDEN LANE, ROYSTON, SG8 9EH

Three storey residential development comprising of 8 x 2 bed flats with associated parking and bin store following demolition of existing dwelling and garage.

Councillor John Bishop advised that he had supported the request of the Parish Council that this application be called in as he felt there was enough merit to require examination by the Committee. He had not however yet formed an opinion regarding this application.

The Area Planning Officer (RT) presented the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, supported by a visual presentation consisting of plans, drawings and photographs of the site.

The Area Planning Officer advised Members that there were a number of corrections to the report as follows:

Paragraph 2.1 – National Planning Policy Framework

The following to be added:

Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Paragraph 2.4 – North Hertfordshire District Local Plan 2011 - 2031

The following to be added:

HE1 Designated Heritage Assets

Paragraph 4.4.1 - Conclusion

Change the number 8 to 7 in the final sentence and the following sentence to be added to the end of the paragraph:

The application site is just within the Royston Conservation Area. However, given the existing 1960's bungalow I am firmly of the view that the carefully considered and architecturally appropriate scheme before you would represent a marked improvement in the character of the area whilst also delivering an additional 7 dwellings.

Paragraph 6.0 - Recommendation

An additional Condition 7 to be added to read:

Details and/or samples of materials to be used on all external elevations and the roof of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced and the approved details shall be implemented on site.

Reason: To ensure that the development will have an acceptable appearance which does not detract from the appearance and character of the surrounding area.

Councillor Sarah Dingley, Member Advocate, thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 17/02482/1.

Councillor Dingley informed Members that the site was a large bungalow that was ripe for development.

It was close to town centre amenities and transport routes, however she wished Members to consider the effect that the development would likely have on neighbours.

Loss of Privacy

The extension of this building to three storeys with 5 windows caused concern that this would intrude on neighbour's privacy.

The proposed development would also remarkably close at only be 2 metres away from neighbours at it closest point.

Access

The access point would be through a gap of approximately 4 metres which was at an awkward angle on a narrow and difficult bend.

There would potentially be a further 10 cars accessing the main road at peak times in addition to those of the 25 houses in the road which could affect the traffic flow.

The exit was at an incline and on a blind corner therefore visibility could cause a problem.

Councillor Dingley welcomed Condition 4 and stated that visibility splay was much needed and should be provided.

Parking

Despite the provision of 10 parking spaces, there was a valid concern that two bedroomed flats would require two rather than one parking space.

Other Developments

The guest house was currently being developed to provide 6 one bedroomed flats and 4 bedsits meaning that there would be a large number of new dwellings provided in a short space of time on a very narrow road.

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

The Chairman thanked Councillor Dingley for her presentation.

The Chairman advised that he has known Mr Farrell, the Applicant's Agent for a number of years although he had not seen him for a number of years and had no social or other contact, other than they once coached at the same swimming club.

Mr David Farrell, Applicant's Agent, thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the committee in support of application 17/02482/1.

Mr Farrell informed Members that this application had been the subject of the formal pre-application process and that the design had taken into account the comments from the Planning Authority with the recommendation in the report being for approval of the development.

He wished to address the points made by the Town Council, who had objected to the development.

Loss of Privacy

Members should note the angle of the building and that there was only one window that was adjacent to Number 27 at first floor level. The building was set back 2.5 metres at this point and the window was at an oblique angle to the garden.

The building did not have any privacy issues at that point.

Access

The visibility splay was 2.4 X 22 metres and had been clearly met.

In respect of the additional vehicles from this development and another development currently underway, the development underway preceded this application and the advice given by Highways would have been given with the knowledge of that application having been approved.

Parking Spaces

The near to town argument enabled the parking requirements to be reduced and there was another development in the area that had provided no parking spaces and cycle parking had been increased.

The Chairman thanked Mr Farrell for his presentation.

Members asked what would happen to the wall that formed the boundary along the pavement, whether there was a pedestrian access onto Barkway Street from the front of the building and whether individual flat owners would be responsible for putting bins out, or whether this would form part of the management of the property.

The Area Planning Officer advised that the wall would remain, that there was no pedestrian access from the front of the building onto Barkway Street and that there were no details provided regarding refuse.

Members felt walking should be encouraged and therefore there should be a pedestrian access onto the footpath to enable people to walk into the town and that there should be more detail regarding waste collection.

In order to address these issues the Area Planning Officer suggested a new condition that there should be a waste strategy prior to implementation and a further condition that details of a pedestrian access be submitted.

RESOLVED: That application **17/02482/1** be **GRANTED** planning permission, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager and the additional conditions and reasons below.

Additional Condition 7 to read:

Details and/or samples of materials to be used on all external elevations and the roof of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced and the approved details shall be implemented on site.

Reason: To ensure that the development will have an acceptable appearance which does not detract from the appearance and character of the surrounding area.

Additional Condition 8 to read:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a scheme setting out how domestic waste will be put out and collected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Reason: To clarify how domestic waste from the development will be managed on collection days.

Additional Condition 9 to read:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of dedicated pedestrian access to Barkway Street shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Reason: To facilitate improved pedestrian access to the town centre.

111 17/01807/1 - LAND ADJACENT TO TOWNSEND HOUSE, 24 LUCAS LANE, ASHWELL, BALDOCK, SG7 5LN

Erection of 4 x 3 bed dwellings with creation of new vehicular access off of Lucas Lane (amended by plans received 26/10/2017).

The Area Planning Officer (RT) advised that there was a correction needed to the report as follows:

Paragraph 2.4

The following to be added:

HE1 Designated Heritage Assets

The Area Planning Officer presented the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, supported by a visual presentation consisting of plans, drawings and photographs of the site.

Mt Justin McCarthy and Parish Councillor David Short thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 17/01807/1.

Mr McCarthy informed Members that sustainability meant ensuring better lives not worse lives for future generations.

This development did not meet the threshold for sustainability as it failed a number of core policies in the NPPF and therefore should not be allowed on this form for the following reasons:

- The building was over large and dominant;
- The poor quality of design did not protect or enhance the Ashwell Conservation Area and therefore would be harmful to its significance;
- The development would be harmful to the significance of the other listed building this part of the Conservation Area;
- The development would be harmful to the natural environment as it would result in the unnecessary removal of hedgerows and endanger the remaining hedgerows and trees;
- The certain reduction of parking along Lucas Lane and the lack of visitor parking would have a negative effect on resident's amenity of the playing field;
- As a small development it would have limited public benefit in terms of increasing housing numbers.

It failed the core principle of Paragraph 17 of the NPPF which stated that decision taking should not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives.

This development did not do this and it could be done better and with less impact and harm.

This development did not respond to the intrinsic character of the countryside and did not deliver high quality design in a rural setting.

It did not conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.

In terms of design it failed Paragraph 64 which stated that Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

In heritage terms it also failed Policies 132,134 and 137 as the development would be harmful to the Ashwell Conservation Area and failed to enhance it.

This was not an objection from the point of view of nimbysism, but it was important to ensure that, if development took place, that it was of the highest quality and standards, that it was as good as it could be, that it met the sustainability test of the NPPF and did not harm the natural or historic environment.

The Parish needed to grow in a sustainable way and any development should enhance the built form of the village and not detract from or harm its setting.

Mr McCarthy concluded by appealing to Councillors to only grant permission if they were 100 percent certain that any adverse and harmful impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the public benefits of this small but very consequential development.

Parish Councillor Short informed Members that he was speaking on behalf of Ashwell Parish Council.

The development would take away an urban space which gave character to the area and was contrary to the spacial vision of the Local Plan 2011-2031 and Paragraphs 12 and 16 of the Ashwell Village Design Statement.

Lucas Lane was very dangerous and the highways statement, particularly for pedestrians and children, had been inadequately considered.

This was probably because the Highways Officer did not attend at a time when the recreation ground was in use which was generally at weekends, evenings and school holidays when the road is congested.

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

Lucas Lane ran along the recreation ground, which was very well used with active football club, cricket club, football club for children and junior cricket club, there were also a buggy fit class and an NHDC play scheme during the holidays.

When these clubs were playing or practicing Lucas Lane was filled with cars.

This was not a safe road and some years ago there was a fatality at the Lucas Lane/Station Road junction.

The Parish Council was very concerned that further parked cars in Lucas Lane raised the potential for a further accident.

This development also created a new entrance onto Lucas Lane, which not only removed a parking space, but created another danger spot and more congestion.

Parish Councillor Short concluded by stating that if this development were to go ahead, there was potential for an accident, or worse another death.

The Chairman thanked Mr McCarthy and Parish Councillor Short for their presentation.

The Chairman advised that this application had been called in by Councillor Paterson. He advised that he would expect Councillors who called in applications to make a presentation to the Committee.

Members asked for clarification regarding refuse bin storage and who would be responsible for maintaining the hedge.

The Area Planning Officer advised that the hedge made a significant contribution to the street scene and that the responsibility for maintenance would remain with the owner of the property, however enforcement of any condition regarding the hedge would be difficult.

The bin store was on the property behind the hedge.

Members acknowledged that Lucas Lane was a busy road and was often congested.

Some Members expressed concern that the proposed development was of poor design which did nothing to enhance the area, although acknowledged that there were no defensible planning reasons to refuse it.

RESOLVED: That application **17/01807/1** be **GRANTED** planning permission, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

112 17/02628/1 - ICKLEFORD MANOR, TURNPIKE LANE, ICKLEFORD, HITCHIN, SG5 3XE

Reserved Matters application for the approval of the external appearance of outline application 16/02012/1 granted 31/07/2017 for the development of 19 residential dwellings together with associated vehicular access and parking following demolition of existing commercial buildings.

The Area Planning Officer (TR) presented the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, supported by a visual presentation consisting of plans, drawings and photographs of the site.

Members asked for clarification regarding parking, construction and turning circles provided for emergency vehicle access.

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

The Area Planning Officer advised that the outline planning permission had a construction management plan condition attached and that the access provisions, including turning circle for service vehicles had been agreed at the outline stage. This application related purely to the appearance of the dwellings.

RESOLVED: That application **17/02628/1** be **GRANTED** reserved matters approval, subject to conditions and reasons set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

113 17/02466/1 - GLYFADA, GOSMORE ROAD, HITCHIN, SG4 9BE

Erection of 6 detached five bed dwellings including creation of new vehicular access off of Hitchin Road following demolition of existing dwelling.

The Area Planning Officer (TR) advised that an amended landscaping plan had been submitted to include a 1.8m high close boarded fence along the northern boundary.

The Area Planning Officer presented the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, supported by a visual presentation consisting of plans, drawings and photographs of the site.

Mr John Wilkins thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 17/02466/1.

Mr Wilkins informed Members that he wished to object to the application in its current form.

As had been noted in the pre-application advice, the Green Belt boundary would need to be moved to facilitate the building of six substantial 5 bedroomed houses.

One third of the whole site lay within the Green Belt as designated by the current proposals map of the Local Plan with alterations 1996 (saved Policies 2007).

Any residential development on the Green Belt proportion of this site would be considered inappropriate development and therefore contrary to the Green Belt Policy.

Following representations by the site owners, it now appeared that this was regarded as an anomaly by the Council.

The original residential curtilage of Glyfada comprised of approximately one acre and subsequently the corner of an adjacent field of approximately half acre was added.

The additional land was absorbed in to the garden area and a line of conifers were planted along the southern boundary of the whole site. It was this adjacent field that was in the Green Belt.

This was discussed during a site visit attended by the Area Planning Officer and Phillips Planning Consultants last summer, when no visual evidence of the Green Belt boundary could be found and it was proposed that the boundary of the Green Belt be changed to follow the line of the trees along the southern boundary of the application site.

There was evidence of the current Green Belt boundary on the Land Registry Plan for title HD479626, the application site.

Mr Wilkins advised that when he became aware that the emerging Local Plan proposed an amended Green Belt boundary he sought urgent information regarding the proposal to move the boundary from the Council to which he had not yet received a reply.

He contended that the Green Belt boundary should not be changed to accommodate this development in its present form.

Further objections had been raised by the owners of the adjacent properties as follows:

- The first floor balcony planned for Plot 3, which overlooked the gardens of Kurinji and the Reddings, would result in a loss of privacy;
- The large first floor window of Plot 4, which overlooked the garden of the Reddings would result in a loss of privacy;
- Plots 3 and 4 were also much closer than the existing house to the eastern boundary, which was adjacent to the above properties.

Mr Wilkins summarised by stating that the proposed development was unlikely to meet local needs, the house, valued in the region of £1 million each, would be targeted at London buyers.

The Chairman thanked Mr Wilkins for his presentation.

Mr Paul Watson, Applicant's Agent, thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee in support of application 17/02466/1.

Mr Watson informed Members that the proposal had been the subject of very detailed pre-application consideration by officers and the advice received regarding layout, design and character had been readily accepted and incorporated into the proposal.

The report set out a very comprehensive assessment of the application's merits and recommended that planning permission be approved subject to conditions.

In respect of the southern site boundary, the current owner of the site had lived in the property for 40 years and in that time had not touched the boundary. If there had been an historic change to that boundary it must have taken place some 45 to 50 years ago. This boundary was marked by very mature and substantial conifers.

The Council had agreed and submitted for examination the Local Plan, which included that the Green Belt boundary be amended to follow the current boundary of the site.

It had been suggested that the boundary was being changed to accommodate this development this was not true. The Council undertook a Green Belt review as part of the Local Plan and this development has come along subsequent to that review.

In respect of privacy of neighbours, the adjacent properties benefitted from very long gardens and combined with the length of the gardens if Plots 3 and 4, the physical separation would be between 62 and 72 metres, which compared very favourably with the accepted guideline of 21 metres.

In addition to the high hedge there would be boundary treated landscaping which provided mitigation.

Mr Watson concluded by thanking the officers for their advice through the pre-application stage and the positive approach taken regarding the application.

This was an extremely well considered and high quality scheme that he urged Members to support.

Members asked for clarification regarding the screening that would provide mitigation regarding privacy.

Mr Watson advised that there was an existing hedge which could be enhanced as felt appropriate under the landscaping condition.

The Chairman thanked Mr Watson for his presentation

Members asked for clarification regarding the boundary of the Green Belt and that the proposed balconies would not affect the privacy of neighbours.

The Area Planning Officer advised that the Green Belt Boundary had been reviewed as part of the work associated with the Local Plan. An anomaly had been noticed in respect of this boundary and a decision had been made to correct that in the emerging Local Plan.

It should be noted that it was possible to recommend approval of development within the Green Belt providing there were very special circumstances and these had been set out at Page 76 of the report.

In respect of privacy, the Area Planning Officer advised that the back gardens of the neighbours were some 50 metres in depth to the boundary and a further 10 metres from the boundary to the new properties and this distance was more than acceptable as the back to back distance stated in the emerging Local Plan was 30 metres. There were no distances quoted in the emerging Local Plan in respect of distance to gardens.

RESOLVED: That application **17/02466/1** be **GRANTED** planning permission, subject to conditions and reasons set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

114 ELECTION OF A CHAIRMAN

Councillor Barnard advised that he would be declaring an interest regarding the next item on the agenda and asked for nominations for a Chairman to chair this item.

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED: That Councillor Tony Hunter be elected as Chairman of the Planning Control Committee for the duration of the next item on the agenda.

115 17/02025/1 - NODE PARK, HITCHIN ROAD, CODICOTE

Demolition of partially constructed dwelling and associated garage and erection of 2 dwellings with associated access, parking, gardens and partial rebuilding of existing garden wall.

Prior to commencement of the item Councillor David Barnard (Chairman) declared a declareable interest as he was a board member of North Herts Homes. He advised that he would take no part in the debate or vote on this item and left the room.

Councillor Tony Hunter took the Chair

The Senior Planning Officer (KP) advised that Conditions 5 and 6 were identical in the report therefore Condition 6 would be omitted and the subsequent conditions be renumbered accordingly.

There was one update to the report in that an email had been received from the owner of Japanese Garden in which the summary read:

I would like to reiterate my concerns and objection to the proposed scheme for all the valid reasons previously outlined both now and in the past in connection with the Node:

- The damage to the historic character and parkland setting of the Node, the walled garden and Grade II Listed Peach House;

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

- The damage to the openness of the Green Belt contrary to National Planning Policy Framework Sections 7, 9, 11 and 12;
- The impact on the existing orchard and the apparent failure to acknowledge or respect the UK Traditional Orchards habitat Action Plan in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework;
- The potential impact on existing trees by the proposed location and construction of new buildings which is both unnecessary and avoidable and contrary to the recommendations set out in BS: 5837: 2012;
- The impact on existing mature trees by the proposed subdivision of land and the insensitive location of proposed new planting within the root protection area of a BS: 5837: 2012 Category A1 mature oak tree. In arboriculture and landscape terms this proposal is farcical.

The Area Planning Officer presented the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, supported by a visual presentation consisting of plans, drawings and photographs of the site.

Ms Katharine Gillings thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee in objection to application 17/02025/1.

Ms Gillings informed Members that she owned Japanese Garden and was a professional Landscape Architect.

She drew attention to impact on the trees by the new buildings and the road.

The report stated that these matters could be dealt with later but this was not the case as excavations, provision of the road, the layby and services would have an impact on the root protection area of the trees.

The report referred to root pruning, canopy pruning and other work necessary, however this work was not necessary as the road could be relocated so as not to affect the trees, which were mature trees of high quality.

The mature grade one oak tree already had a trench dug through the root protection area and a laurel hedge planted in it, which was contrary to British Standard.

This scheme proposed removing the laurel hedge to plant more appropriate hedging, but also proposed digging another trench closer to the trunk of the tree which was even more against British Standard and was ridiculous.

It was a shame that the landscape comments in the report were limited and failed to offer any wider aspect comments on the walled garden and there was no evidence that any guidance had been sought regarding arboriculture.

Ms Gillings concluded by stating that all issues of concern regarding refuse, sewage, fire exits, water, the road, trees and all other issues should be agreed by the planning officer prior to granting of permission. Without these issues being resolved it was not possible to assess the full impact of the scheme on the character of the garden and the Green Belt.

The Chairman thanked Ms Gillings for her presentation.

Ms Sophie Pain, Applicant's Agent, thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the Committee in support of application 17/02025/1.

Ms Pain informed Members that she worked for Beacon Planning and was representing the applicant, Rowan Homes Limited.

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

The Case Officer had provided a very comprehensive report, which identified that the balance of planning consideration was in favour of granting planning permission, subject to the recommended conditions, all of which the applicant accepted.

The proposed development sought to remove the partially constructed dwelling known as the Round House and replace it with two dwellings.

The construction of the Round House had ceased due to financial reasons and the fact that there had been no interest from prospective buyers, given its layout and appearance.

This proposal sought to bring forward two dwellings, which were both deliverable and marketable. Not only would this scheme allow for the impressive garden wall to be restored, but would also enable a means of on-going ownership for the listed glass peach house and the parklands in which it sits.

The proposal to remove permitted development rights within this area in order to protect the character and appearance of the area was understood and accepted as a condition.

The design and position of the proposed dwellings had been the result of on-going discussions with Officers prior to the submission of the application and during its determination.

The locations of these properties towards the boundaries of the site took into account comments raised in the previous application regarding retaining the views of the listed building across the parkland from the access road. It was considered that this development successfully achieved that aim.

During the course of this application, discussions had taken place regarding alternative locations for the garage belonging to Plot 4. Some feasibility work was undertaken, but alternative locations would have resulted in the turning area being in the centre of the garden for that plot, thereby compromising the amenity for future residents.

Advice was sought regarding the landscaping, a tree survey was undertaken and landscape architects had input into the layout of the site.

The position of the buildings and the road had been designed to take account of the existing trees and only one tree was proposed for removal and a further six trees required work. The tree management would be required whether or not the development went ahead.

Across the site a further 32 trees would be planted as part of the landscaping proposals, together with hedgerows, shrubs and vegetation. There was a suite of conditions that dealt with these aspects as well as landscape management in perpetuity.

The proposal was to demolish a partially constructed dwelling of an unusual design, which occupied a prominent position on the site and to replace it with two properties, which in total, reduced the volume of development by 23 percent.

Such development was justified as an exception to Green Belt policy, both locally and nationally.

The proposals were not materially larger nor did they have a materially greater impact on the purposes of the Green Belt than the existing buildings on the site.

The proposal would bring with it benefits, which would enhance the estate and secure long term stewardship for important heritage assets and parkland, which was not possible through the existing permitted scheme.

Ms Pain concluded by asking the Committee to support officer recommendations.

The Chairman thanked Ms Pain for her presentation.

Members sought clarification that there was a proposed condition to protect existing trees.

The Senior Planning Officer referred Member to Condition 7.

Members commented that the Committee had to consider the application as presented and that the developer would need to pay attention to issues such as British Standards when undertaking the landscaping.

The Senior Planning Officer informed Members that the road had been partially constructed under the permission given for the Round House development and acknowledged that it would impinge very slightly on the root protection area of the sycamore tree.

Members queried whether some of the planned 32 new trees would be fruit trees and whether an arboricultural survey had been undertaken by the Council.

The Senior Planning Officer advised that the applicant had submitted an arboricultural survey and the Council's landscape design architect considered the landscaping scheme and raised no objection.

In respect of the new trees, the Applicant was proposing to reinstate the orchard and the details of that could be included in the landscape management plan, which was the subject of Condition 4.

Members acknowledged that this was a development in the Green Belt, however the report did outline the very special circumstances and the proposed buildings were no larger than the original footprint.

RESOLVED: That, subject to the deletion of Condition 6 and the renumbering of subsequent conditions, application **17/02025/1** be **GRANTED** planning permission, subject to conditions and reasons set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

Councillor David Barnard returned to the room and resumed the Chair.

116 PLANNING APPEALS

The Area Planning Officer (TR) presented the report of the Development and Conservation Manager entitled Planning Appeals and drew attention to the following:

The appeal decision regarding land to the south of Bendish Lane and adjacent to 2-12 Cresswick, Whitwell was an amended decision issued by the Planning Inspectorate as there was an error regarding one of the conditions.

Members queried whether the application for costs regarding this application had been decided.

The Area Planning Officer advised that they were awaiting the result.

The Chairman advised that the Gladman application at Offley was proposed to be heard by a public enquiry on 29 May 2018.

Members queried whether an appeal had been lodged regarding the CALA homes decision

The Area Planning Officer advised that he understood that there was an appeal and the intention was to report this to the next meeting of the Committee.

Wednesday, 17th January, 2018

RESOLVED: That the report entitled Planning Appeals be noted.

The meeting closed at 10.06 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank