

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

**MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES,
LETCWORTH GARDEN CITY, SG6 3JF
ON THURSDAY, 24TH JULY, 2025 AT 7.00 PM**

MINUTES

Present: *Councillors: Nigel Mason (Chair), Emma Fernandes (Vice-Chair), Clare Billing, Mick Debenham, Steve Jarvis, Ian Mantle, Bryony May, Caroline McDonnell, Martin Prescott and Dave Winstanley.*

In Attendance: *Faith Churchill (Democratic Services Apprentice), Sam Dicocco (Principal Planning Officer), Robert Filby (Trainee Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), Ben Glover (Senior Planning Officer), Arhamna Jafri (Locum Planning Lawyer), Edward Leigh (Senior Transport Policy Officer), James Lovegrove (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager), Tom Rea (Senior Planning Officer) and Naomi Reynard (Senior Planning Officer).*

Also Present: *At the commencement of the meeting, approximately 30 members of the public, including registered speakers.*

Councillors Cathy Brownjohn, Sarah Lucas, Vijaiya Poopalasingham, Laura Williams and Ralph Muncer were in attendance as Member Advocates.

21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Audio recording – 2 minutes 9 seconds

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ruth Brown, Val Bryant, Louise Peace and Tom Tyson.

Having given due notice, Councillor Mick Debenham substituted for Councillor Bryant and Councillor Steve Jarvis substituted for Councillor Brown.

22 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Audio recording – 2 minutes 32 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 advised that Section 4.8.23(a) of the Constitution applied to the meeting.
- (5) The Chair advised that there had been a change to the agenda order since publication and that Agenda Item 2 would be taken after Agenda Item 4.

23 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Audio recording – 4 minutes 58 seconds

N.B. Councillor Clare Billing entered the Council Chamber at 19.05.

The Chair confirmed that the registered speakers were in attendance.

24 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

Audio recording – 6 minutes 8 seconds

The Chair advised that there had been one item of business notified for 25/00104/FP Land to the Rear of Banyers Hotel, King James Way, Royston, Hertfordshire, SG8 7BZ.

The Chair reported that the item was deferred from the Planning Control Committee on 17 July 2025 as the Member Advocates who called-in the application were not present at the meeting (as required under the Members Planning Code of Good Conduct) and did not arrange for another Member to present on their behalf or provide a written statement for the Chair to read out in their absence, as required under 6.1 of the Speaking Procedure for the Planning Control Committee.

However, the matter could not wait until the scheduled meeting of the Committee on 7 August as the statutory period for the matter to be determined had already been extended (to 30 July 2025), meaning that the Council could be liable to appeal against the failure to determine the application.

Therefore, the Chair advised that the item would be considered as urgent under this item on the agenda.

The Senior Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters relating to Application 25/00104/FP and advised that:

- Two further letters of objection had been received from the occupiers of number 4 and number 29 King James Way which could be found on the Council website.
- Concerns from residents had been raised on highway safety, lack of parking, adverse impact on local wildlife and trees as well as the potential impact of the development on the setting and significance of adjacent listed buildings.
- The occupier of number 33 Hunters Mews had highlighted inaccuracies in the daylight and sunlight assessment and queried some of the below standard 25-degree guidance results.
- In response, consultants working for the Applicant advised that images found in Appendices D and E of the assessment report demonstrated that neighbouring properties were not cloned as a single unit and this was further clarified by aerial view modelling provided.
- They also advised that existing buildings had been accurately positioned in the report using the site layout and topographical survey drawings that had been submitted with the application.
- Only five windows on number 33 Hunters Mews retained at least 80% of their former vertical sky limit value as per the guidelines of the Building Research Establishment (BRE). However, all windows retained over 15% of their former value which was considered acceptable for urban developments.
- It was acknowledged that the 25-degree guidance had not been met and consultants had followed further guidance to address this by undertaking additional checks. These revealed that adequate levels of daylight could be received by number 33 Hunters Mews.
- The full response from the consultants could be found on the Council website.

The Senior Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of Application 25/00104/FP and gave a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

In response to questions from Councillor Dave Winstanley, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- As the statutory 10% net biodiversity gain would not be achieved on-site, the Applicant would need to purchase the required habitat units from a land bank and submit certification of this to the Council to discharge the biodiversity net gain condition on the application.
- The 10% net gain would be measured against the biodiversity already existent on the site.

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

- The application ignored the prominence of the Grade I listed building at number 18 Melbourn Street.
- Despite the ownership change of the land, the development was still within the curtilage of the listed building and the relevant planning restrictions should apply.
- Rich history was buried beneath the land and there had been no proposal to excavate the land to investigate its past.
- Residents of King James Way were worried about the overspill of parked vehicles that might arise from the development as there was already insufficient parking in the nearby area.
- There were also concerns over rainwater runoff from the site and that drainage was not adequately equipped to accommodate increased water flow.
- Wildlife on the existing site was incredible and its loss because of the development would be felt greatly by neighbouring residents.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

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

- They were the resident of number 33 Hunters Mews and the Director of Hunters Mews Residents Association which represented residents of both Hunters Mews and Dog Kennel Lane.
- The daylight and sunlight assessment supplied by the Applicant was factually incorrect as it excluded number 30 Hunters Mews from the report, classing it as a property on Dog Kennel Lane, and numbers 31 to 35 Hunters Mews were merged into one property which could be seen on pages 16 and 17 of the report.
- Because of this, the report did not identify that number 33 Hunters Mews was the closest and most effective property to the proposed site with seven windows facing it. All seven windows would be less than 5.5 metres away from the west elevation of the proposed residential building.
- East facing windows of number 33 had enjoyed uninterrupted light for twenty-five years, providing natural light for several primary rooms and the only light for both sets of stairs, landing and hallway within the property.
- If the 25-degree rule was applied, five out of the seven east facing windows would receive almost no light and be in constant shade as evident on pages 32 and 33 of the report which showed that they failed the light test with some windows losing up to 43% of their existing light.

- Members should remove the data manipulation described from their decision-making process.
- It was expected that the main occupiers of the proposed dwellings would be 25-34 years old. They would be the least likely age group to fully utilise the local amenities within walking distance such as the health centre, banking hub, day care nurseries, primary schools and High Street.
- The site was on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), within a conservation area on Grade I listed land, and adjacent to a Grade II listed building, thus having a major impact on these properties.
- The proposed height of the two-storey building seemed unnecessary and had been designed to potentially house more residents in the future.

In response to a point of clarification from Councillor Bryony May, Mr Brickles advised that an Ecology Advisor had informed them that the site was within the impact zone of Therfield Heath which was an SSSI. Because of this, Natural England would need to be consulted as the application fell into the residential category of development.

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

- The development was too large, too dense, unduly high, too close to neighbouring dwellings, unsympathetic to the conservation area, would not provide to demographics that would use local amenities and would impact the light within existing neighbouring properties as already outlined.
- Two further objections on the application had been received recently from an Ecology Advisor and the Local Lead Flood Authority. These objections were related to the development being within the impact zone of an SSSI and flood risk respectively.
- Its location conflicted with listed buildings and lower density housing nearby.
- Royston had more than fulfilled its housing obligation with many large developments already constructed, in the build phase or in the pipeline.
- Developments had already provided hundreds of houses at the outer edges of the town, pushing its spatial footprint to the limit of capacity and stretching its resources such as water and services.
- The application would not serve the need for affordable housing nor provide the type of housing that those wanting to live in a central location would need such as families and the elderly.
- The site was within a surface flow water path meaning that there would be an increased risk of surface water flooding.
- The Lead Local Flood Authority recommended that the application should pass a sequential test which should be carried out as a matter of urgency.
- The open green space on the site was not only a space for wildlife but also acted as a CO₂ sink.
- Traffic was an existing problem in Royston with the A10 running through its centre and the loss of town centre amenities in recent years meant some residents drove across the town frequently to access alternatives.
- Given the above concerns and the right to light of neighbouring properties, the Committee should further investigate the application.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Councillor Brownjohn for her presentation and invited the Applicant, Mr Hamish Borno to speak in support of the application. Mr Borno thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- Hard work had taken place with the Senior Planning Officer to shape the application into its current state.
- Both local and national planning policy had been accounted for and there was no policy reason for the application to be refused.
- Therfield Heath was roughly two miles away from the proposed site with approximately 500-1,000 dwellings between it and the application site, making it difficult to understand how the development would impact the SSSI.
- The daylight and sunlight assessment met the BRE guidelines which had been verified by the Senior Planning Officer.
- The Highways Authority were satisfied with the application.
- Pollution was not relevant to planning policies required to be met by the development.
- The land on the proposed site had never been owned by number 18 Melbourn Street and was not related to it.
- The archaeological assessment did not require them to excavate the site before construction.
- By working with all parties, they had satisfied all policy requirements and were hopeful that the Committee would grant the application.

In response to points of clarification from Councillor Martin Prescott, Mr Borno advised that:

- He disagreed with Mr Brickles on the daylight and sunlight assessment.
- The public had been consulted through the public consultation process, with details of these responses included on the planning portal.
- Decisions on applications needed to be made considering local and national planning policy.

Councillor Emma Fernandes proposed to grant permission and this was seconded by Councillor Dave Winstanley.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Mick Debenham
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Caroline McDonnell

The following points were made as part of the debate:

- The application met all the planning considerations, however, the major opposition from nearby residents was concerning.
- There was disagreement between the Public Objector, Mr Brickles and the Applicant on the accuracy of the daylight and sunlight assessment.
- The previous application for this site was refused and it was unclear what had changed about the application since its refusal.
- The roof height seemed out of proportion with the development and there could be potential for living space within the roof.
- The development was in a good central location and young occupiers would reduce car use in the town centre.

In response to points made in the debate, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- BRE guidance was a widely recognised document that provided guidelines for assessing daylight and sunlight schemes, however, it was not legally binding and was intended to be flexible to help with decision making.
- The daylight and sunlight assessment had been undertaken by a professional lighting engineer who had used the BRE guidance and modelling tools as part of the assessment.
- The consultants acknowledged that some of the windows on number 33 Hunters Mews had failed to meet the percentages in the BRE guidance, however, flexibility was needed in urban situations where it was not always possible to achieve these percentages.
- Retaining as little as 15% of the former light was considered by many authorities as acceptable in urban settings as detailed previously.
- Images in the document showed that all properties had been modelled and consequently, all windows had been accounted for.
- The Conservation Officer was satisfied that the impact of the development on the Grade I listed building at number 18 Melbourn Street was not significant as the harm was at the lower end of the less than substantial scale.
- An archaeological condition on the application required a written scheme of investigation to be submitted by the Applicant and assessed by the Historic Buildings Advisor at Hertfordshire County Council.
- The development was not within the Local Plan but was within the urban area and town centre of Royston which was acceptable, and the application had been looked at on its merits.
- The previous application was unacceptable due to its height, the number of dwellings, the impact on adjoining residencies and its design as it was three storeys in height and on a different alignment.
- Since the previous application, the Applicant had moved the building to an east-west alignment after recommendations from the Conservation Officers, reduced its height by one storey and incorporated design features to make it more acceptable within the conservation area.
- Plain roof tiles were expected on dwellings in conservation areas and they required at least a 35-degree pitch, therefore, the steep pitch of the proposed building was consistent with the conservation area.
- There would be no permitted development rights in the roof space of the proposed building, therefore, building further dwellings into the roof space would require planning permission.
- Planning permission to add more dwellings into the roof space would likely be refused as there would be a need for additional parking spaces, amenity space and the building may be unacceptable in its altered appearance, however, it would depend on the application.

In response to points in the debate, the Team Leader Major Sites advised that:

- Permitted development rights would not apply to the building as the dwellings were flats rather than houses and were also within a conservation area, therefore, no condition would be needed on the application to prevent the enlargement of roof space.
- The addition of dormer windows would require planning permission.

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

RESOLVED: That application 25/00104/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the reasons and conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

Following the conclusion of this item, there was a break in proceedings at 19.58 and the meeting reconvened at 20.03.

25 24/02889/FP LAND AT ROUNDWOOD, BACK LANE, GRAVELEY, HERTFORDSHIRE

Audio recording – 1 hour 2 minutes 54 seconds

The Senior Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters within the Addendum to the report in respect of Application 24/02889/FP, as well as other updated matters relating to the application and advised that:

- The Lead Local Flood Authority had withdrawn their objection to the application.
- Wording on the Highways Strand 2 contribution within the S106 table had been corrected and updated.
- Multiple conditions within the report had been added, amended and combined.
- Summaries of representations from both nearby residents and Weston Parish Council had been included.
- A Highways and Transport Addendum had been written in response to recent objections from Great Ashby Community Council, Weston Parish Council and North Herts Councillors representing Great Ashby Ward.
- A summary of a representation made by a resident detailing an accident outside their home in Graveley had been provided.
- A further representation from them detailed concerns over road traffic safety from increased traffic on Church Lane/Back Lane and included photos of the accident previously mentioned.
- Condition 5 in the recommendations section of the report had been amended with the agreement of the Highways Authority which changed the wording from “prior to first use” to “prior to first occupation”.
- Condition 16 had been amended to include: “The approved Ecological Enhancement Plan shall be implemented on site.”
- Condition 18 had been amended to include: “The approved details shall be implemented on site and permanently maintained.”
- The off-site play space contribution towards Merrick Close Play Area Improvement in the S106 table on page 78 should include: “index linked”.
- The Applicant wished to either deliver the improvements to Graveley Public Right of Way 010 themselves or offer a contribution and because of this, the Strand 1 section of the S106 table had been amended.
- The wording of the Right of Way Condition 7 would be amended to include: “Unless the applicant pays the s106 contribution they shall deliver the improvement works.”.

The Senior Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of Application 24/02889/FP supported by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Steve Jarvis
- Councillor Bryony May
- Councillor Caroline McDonnell

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

- For the site to be sustainable, a bus stop needed to be within 400 metres of the site, therefore, a bus route was proposed to pass along Mendip Way.
- During the construction phase, there would be a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order which would result in yellow lining along Mendip Way.

- Surveys showed that no mitigations were required to deal with the displacement of vehicles but the monitor and manage system would address this where appropriate.
- No opportunity was available to modify the details submitted at a later stage in the process, as this was a full application.
- In terms of design, there had been a detailed workshop process on this and the Urban Design team felt positively about the scheme as it had a simple material palette which was encouraged as more diverse schemes could be mismatched.
- The new bus route would connect to parts of Stevenage that residents of Great Ashby could not currently access such as the Lister Hospital and secondary schools.
- Most future mitigations were predicted to be implemented outside of the development site.
- The purpose of the monitor and manage scheme was to avoid works being carried out when they were not required. Its operation would involve the Applicant monitoring potential problems and the Highways Authority carrying out works where they thought problems needed to be addressed.
- Evidence of road accidents in the area would have been submitted with the application to the Highways Authority.

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

- An overnight parking survey had been conducted by the Applicant which established that there would be sufficient parking elsewhere for displaced cars resulting from the bus route implementation.
- However, it was unknown how many spaces would be available in parking courts for displaced cars to use, therefore, the monitor and manage system would track parking through the buildout of the development and if additional mitigations were required, more parking spaces would be created.
- To mitigate increased traffic along Back Lane, they could increase the road capacity by formalising several informal passing places and adding new ones if the monitoring indicated that this was required.
- Traffic calming measures could be applied if speeding became an issue, however, the proposed speed limit for Back Lane was 20mph where it would run through the development.
- The road through the development would be wider than Back Lane with more opportunities to pull into side roads, thus agricultural vehicles would cause less congestion than they did currently, but it was recognised that these vehicles were few and it had not been necessary to design the road specifically to accommodate them.
- Discretion was with the Highways Authority when determining whether evidence showed that mitigations were required, and S106 contribution of £400,000 would be held to cover the cost of any necessary mitigations.
- The Applicant would provide the data in accordance with a plan that would be agreed by condition and the baseline for the data would be established through monitoring before construction started.
- Due to uncertainty over the level of impact that displaced cars would have and given the country lane style roads, they felt it was better for the monitor and manage approach to address any issues as they arose rather than assuming a worst-case scenario by implementing mitigation measures before first occupation.
- Any unused funding from the £400,000 after the monitoring period would be returned to the Applicant.
- The design of the monitor and manage programme would be agreed post resolution, however, it would not be constrained to the site boundaries as there would be an impact on the wider road network.
- £400,000 would be enough to cover the costs of potential mitigations such as the creation of passing places or a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to modify speed limits as these were not major measures and a significant number could be bought.

- The Applicant had not assumed that the site would generate a higher proportion of sustainable transport trips than the rest of Great Ashby.
- The Council had strongly encouraged the Applicant to make active travel and public transport more attractive.
- Directing the new bus service up to the roundabout on Haybluff Drive would make it accessible to those living on the new development as well as existing Great Ashby residents who did not have a bus service within easy walking distance.
- Improved access to Orwell Avenue and Botany Bay Lane would give residents access to the cycle network into Stevenage.
- The Transport Assessment detailed that within the most recent 5-year period, no personal injury accidents had occurred along Back Lane where the road bordered the proposed development.
- Incidents observed around the site had been classed as “slight” and no incidents resulting from equine use on Back Lane had been recorded on CrashMap.
- The mechanism of monitoring was yet to be agreed, but the encouraged method would be to use cameras to record vehicle types and observe their routes. If this was done in conjunction with GA2, traffic could be disaggregated from the two sites and their impact on the wider road networks could be assessed individually.

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

- They were speaking on behalf of Weston and Graveley Parish Councils.
- Back Lane was used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and they were concerned about its safety as they believed that more accidents had occurred on the road than the figures showed.
- They were grateful to the developer for amending the plans to account for the comments that were made in the early part of the consultation phase.
- There should be a barrier to prevent access onto Back Lane from Haybluff Drive which could only be bypassed by emergency vehicles.
- A Construction Traffic Management Plan was needed and should be open to consultation as the development would be completed in phases which would affect existing flows of traffic between Great Ashby and Weston.
- Residents were concerned about the monitor and manage scheme as it was certain that more traffic would run through the three main roads in Weston as a result of the site. These roads lacked pavements in stretches and it was essential that mitigations were instated before the first occupancy.
- Unallocated visitor parking needed altering as 86% of the spaces only served 33% of the dwellings with the remaining 14% serving 67%.
- The Council should defer a decision on this until the issues described had been investigated and resolved.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Parish Councillor Moody for their presentation and invited the second Public Objector, Great Ashby Community Councillor Beryl Brown to speak against the application. Councillor Brown thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- Great Ashby Community Council strongly objected to the application in its current state, particularly on its access and infrastructure.
- They were concerned about traffic that would flow through Calder Way as this was a residential street with existing problems and there had been accidents and near misses on this stretch of road.

- Residents of Calder Way had also received abuse and were unable to access their homes if their turn was used as a passing place by oncoming vehicles.
- No vehicle traffic study had been undertaken on Calder Way and there was no evidence to suggest that this road would be able to handle the extra traffic that would result from this development.
- The monitor and manage scheme would not be sufficient as issues already needed resolving before the development had been constructed.
- On-street parking was already an issue and no plans had been provided to demonstrate where the displaced vehicles would park and if the road width around Great Ashby was adequate for wide construction vehicles.
- They would be grateful if the plans for construction and monitor and manage were shared with consultees before a decision on the application was made.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Community Councillor Brown for their verbal presentation and invited the third Public Objector, Ms Emma Hogg to speak against the application. Ms Hogg thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- They were a resident of Graveley and lived on Back Lane.
- Back Lane was a narrow single track which had high banks and no pavements and had at least seven blind bends between Graveley and Chesfield.
- The road was also unlit and would be unsuited to an increase in traffic flow.
- At peak times, the road was often congested and could be dangerous.
- There were signs as traffic entered Church Lane from Back Lane detailing that the road was unsuitable for HGVs and large vehicles. These were largely ignored and created a tremendous inconvenience to road users when they were unable to turn around or reroute.
- There had been numerous accidents and none of the recent ones had been logged on CrashMap.
- A tractor and a family vehicle had collided on a blind bend on Back Lane and there had been another head on collision on a straight section of the road.
- Back Lane was used by walkers, cyclists, Duke of Edinburgh participants, the disabled, and residents and staff of Halcyon Days Care Home homes. Under the current proposals, there were no provisions for these groups.
- The British Horse Society stated that there had been 7 horse rider incidents in the last 3 years on Back Lane.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Ms Hogg for their verbal presentation and invited the Member Advocate Objectors, Councillor Laura Williams and Councillor Vijaiya Poopalasingham to speak against the application. Councillors Williams and Poopalasingham thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- They were speaking on behalf of Great Ashby residents who would be the group most affected by the application before them.
- Residents of Great Ashby understood the need for new homes as they had moved into the area only 20 years prior so their concerns were valid.
- There were no credible answers for where the existing on-street parked cars would be displaced to.
- Traffic access to the site was a foreseeable crisis waiting to happen and the monitor and manage approach would allow problems from this to surface.

- There was no infrastructure in terms of health facilities to accompany the homes on the proposed development.
- Residents felt betrayed by the developer whose proposal would erode their quality of life rather than enrich it.
- Roads such as Mendip Way and Haybluff Drive had not been built to accommodate future growth.
- On 21 November 2024, the Applicant informed Great Ashby Community Council that the early monitoring of the existing estate had been incorrect which had led to the existing parking and traffic problems.
- All parking spaces within the area that would be directly impacted by the displacement of cars were already allocated to existing dwellings.
- They felt that the monitor and manage approach was a green light for the developers to do nothing.
- The land parcelling of GA1 and GA2 was felt to ignore the needs of a thriving community.
- Residents were tired of Great Ashby being used as an example of bad traffic planning and this proposal would only compound the problem.
- There were three material grounds for objection to the application, access and transport, lack of supporting infrastructure and community impact.
- Mendip Way and Calder Way were not fit for the increased traffic that the proposed development would bring with the former already serving six hundred homes and suffering from chronic congestion and lack of parking capacity.
- No clear traffic or parking management plans had been provided.
- The monitor and manage approach was damage control rather than planning.
- At paragraphs 2.5 – 2.7 of the Technical Note, the Applicant admitted that a TRO would be needed to clear vehicles and displace them to nearby roads without evidencing their capacity.
- Parking capacity at paragraph 2.1 of the Technical Note was measured using Great Ashby Way rather than streets near Mendip Way.
- The Highways Authority had refused to meet them to discuss the issues raised.
- Calder Way was a single track, four-metre-wide road at best, acknowledged by the Applicant to be constrained and congested but still suggested as sufficient.
- The data to support this was outdated as it had been gathered in 2022 during the quiet period after the COVID pandemic and ignored the cumulative impact of GA1 and GA2 combined contrary to paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The described modal shift from driving to other forms of transport in response to this development was aspirational rather than data supported as Great Ashby was a commuter community where vehicles were relied upon to access basic amenities.
- The NHS Integrated Care Board (ICB) for the area had made clear that both north and south primary care networks were at capacity, therefore on-site provision would be needed but currently, a new healthcare facility was proposed for Graveley, not Great Ashby.
- They felt that the proposal played on legal technicalities to avoid addressing cumulative impacts that would be felt by this development and GA2.
- Concerns raised were based on 20 years of enduring poor planning decisions that would be made worse by this development.
- Weston Parish Council, Graveley Parish Council, Great Ashby Community Council, nearly all 250 resident responses and the two district councillors representing Great Ashby were united in objection on the same material points.
- To avoid another generation of Great Ashby residents having to suffer because of poor planning, the application should be rejected.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Councillors Williams and Poopalasingham for their verbal presentations and invited the Applicant Representatives, Mr Paul Derry, Mr Richard Kelly and Mr Julian Clarke to speak in support of the application. They thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The Applicant, Croudace Homes Ltd. was a family-owned house builder with its regional office located in Letchworth.
- 112 of the 281 proposed dwellings were classed as affordable, equating to 40%.
- While the site had capacity was for 330 homes, recent works on ecology and biodiversity showed that larger buffers to the adjoining woodland were needed and so the agreed number of 281 would meet the housing need of the district while supporting on-site open space.
- The previous application on the site had been withdrawn due to concerns over its layout, relation to the woodland and possible rat running on the nearby lanes.
- Since its withdrawal, extensive engagement had taken place with District and County Council officers as well as key stakeholders which had culminated in this application that had received support from all statutory consultees.
- The public objections were acknowledged, and their report showed how the application was acceptable despite those.
- The site was allocated for residential development in the adopted Local Plan as site GA1.
- The application was submitted in full and contained full details of each house type, internal road details and landscaped plans that were supported by technical reports.
- Highway access had been discussed thoroughly with officers from both District and County Councils.
- To overcome the risk of rat running identified on the previous application, the site layout had been split into two areas with approximately two thirds accessing the site from Haybluff Drive to the east and the remainder from Back Lane.
- There was no vehicle linkage between these areas except for emergency vehicle access.
- The access had been modelled to respect the existing road network and sought to reduce rat running through neighbouring villages.
- Sustainable links through the site were provided to reduce reliance on car use and provide safe passage for pedestrians and cyclists to the south-east corner of the site where provision would be made for a new bus service, as well as car sharing and cycle hire schemes.
- The Highways Authority were content with the Transport Assessment within the application after imposing mitigations and planning conditions relating to the monitor and manage scheme, construction traffic and parking.
- The proposal met credentials within the Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document and achieved Silver for its passive design, promotion of fabric performance and biodiversity.
- At a minimum, 25% of the dwellings would be fitted with solar panels which was a further benefit beyond the already submitted sustainability reports.
- The site would deliver a 17.8% increase in habitat units and 14.3% increase in hedge row units ensuring the 10% statutory biodiversity net gain would be achieved on-site.
- Provision of a play-on-the-way feature and direct linkage to the Hertfordshire Way would be ensured by the development.
- S106 contributions would support off-site infrastructure in education and healthcare.
- They hoped that the Committee would be happy with the recommendation to grant permission after working with all parties to progress the application to its current state.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Steve Jarvis

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

- It was found that 25% of dwellings would maximise the benefit of solar panels, and this would act as a floor for the percentage of dwellings that would be fitted with them, with the potential for more to be added to this percentage under the technical approvals in the building regulations, but this was not guaranteed.
- Traffic modelling had been focused on highway junctions rather than linear lengths of road.
- The primary access to the site would be from Haybluff Drive which would serve two thirds of the traffic but it was accepted that there would be low volumes of traffic rerouting from Haybluff Drive via Back Lane.
- A comparison of traffic volume along Calder Way during and after a closure of North Road in Stevenage showed that more traffic was attracted to Calder Way during the closure and reduced significantly after North Road was reopened. However, the traffic volume along Calder Way once the development was built would only be a fraction of that which used the road during the closure.
- The Highways Authority sought no more representative analysis of the modelling that was submitted with the application.
- Using their traffic analysis and census information, they estimated that one vehicle would access Calder Way from Back Lane every two minutes in the morning peak hour compared to one vehicle per minute during the closure of North Road, therefore the Highways Authority were content that more sophisticated analysis was not needed.
- The Applicant was agreeable to undertake mitigations before first occupancy as preferred by members of the public, however, the Highways Authority advised that it would go against Local Transport Note 1/20 and their Transport Plan and therefore objected to this. Consequently, after further discussion with officers, monitor and manage had been identified as an appropriate system as Highways did not perceive the development to cause any issues, but this would address any that arose in the future.
- Detailed schemes for using the funding were not specified, therefore, the Highways Authority had flexibility to claim funding from the monitor and manage scheme for a variety of issues.
- They had tried their utmost to structure the monitor and manage approach to satisfy all parties.

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

- The Highways Authority anticipated that the development would not cause significant harm in terms of congestion or shortage of parking thus they had not raised an objection to the scheme and consequently, the monitor and manage approach had been opted for.
- It would be unreasonable to ask the Applicant to create a Construction Traffic Management Plan before permission on the application was granted and this should be created at an optimal point.
- Emergency access had been covered in the Addendum to the report.
- The number of visitor spaces was slightly below the amount needed but this would be offset by some dwellings having more spaces allocated to them than required.
- The Applicant was only required to mitigate the impacts of their development, not preexisting issues.
- The NHS ICB had looked strategically in the wider Stevenage area and recommended that S106 contributions should be made to a medical facility on the NS1 site. There was the hope that this facility would take pressure away from existing facilities in the area.

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

- The speed limit on Back Lane and Calder Way was currently 30mph and a consultation had already been taken with the public to reduce speed limits to 20mph in the

Stevenage and Great Ashby area, however, this did not receive sufficient support to proceed.

- However, the Highways Authority could propose to reduce the speed limit on Back Lane or Calder Way if they felt that it was needed and this would go through the usual consultation process.
- While the Applicant had modelled the cumulative impact of GA1 and GA2 on the wider road network and the Highways Authority did not feel the need to add any mitigations on this, it would be the responsibility of the GA2 developer to carry out any mitigations resulting from the cumulative impact of its development.
- The Highways Authority had not objected to the proposal, therefore, it would not defend the refusal of the application if it was appealed by the Applicant.

In response to verbal presentations, the Team Leader Major Sites advised that:

- The Highways Authority had indicated that no mitigation measures were required at this stage and had not raised an objection to the application.
- If the Council made a decision on the application contrary to the recommendations of the Highways Authority, they could refuse to sign off any alternative uses for the S106 contributions as they were an S106 signatory.
- There was an extension on the statutory consultation period of this application until 31 July 2025 and deferral could risk an appeal from the Applicant on the grounds of non-determination.

The following Members asked additional questions:

- Councillor Steve Jarvis
- Councillor Martin Prescott

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

- Construction management plans were available on the Council website if members of the public wanted to comment on them, however, it was not normal for them to carry out consultations on them as applications for approval of details reserved by condition required the Council to make a decision on them within eight weeks. Instead, they relied on consultation with the Highways Authority.
- The Environmental Health team would be consulted on the noise generation aspect of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- One advantage to the monitor and manage approach was that Hertfordshire County Council could consult on the mitigation measures before they were implemented through their normal consultation process which would take into account the differing views of stakeholders.

In response to additional questions, the Team Leader Major Sites advised that:

- The monitor and manage approach was a condition that had been recommended by the Highways Authority, therefore, reaching out to members of the public for comments on this could potentially cause frustration if the Highways Authority chose to uphold their recommendation.
- Members of the public were welcome to register on the Planning Portal to comment on applications and receive notifications on existing applications and new applications.

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

- The Highways Authority was not keen to implement mitigations prematurely as it could exacerbate problems such as rat running.

- The monitor and manage approach would optimise the timing of mitigations by meeting needs where they arose rather than creating additional capacity for use by the wrong parties.
- There were different types of mitigations and putting footways in Weston would not mitigate the impacts of this development but Strand 2 Highways Contributions from this site could potentially be spent on improving these.
- The monitor and manage scheme did not have full details of the mitigations that would be implemented as these would be developed flexibly in response to modelling and observed data.

Councillor Ian Mantle proposed to grant permission and this was seconded by Councillor Mick Debenham.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Steve Jarvis
- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Nigel Mason
- Councillor Ian Mantle

The following points were raised as part of the debate:

- Aside from the access issues, the development was deemed as good.
- The monitor and manage approach would not deliver a satisfactory result for Great Ashby and Graveley residents, therefore, a better system should be devised before granting permission.
- The monitor and manage system was a concern as there were lots of preexisting problems in Great Ashby and the development would only compound these.
- The Highways Authority did not see any issues to object to the application, but just in case issues did arise, they would be addressed with the monitor and manage approach.
- The development was acceptable and it was noted by the public objectors that the developer had worked hard to provide solutions to several issues that had been identified. However, there was concern over the access to the development and more detail would be needed on the monitor and manage approach before permission was granted as it would not adequately address the access issues.
- Due to the Council being unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply in the district, the adverse impacts would have to significantly outweigh the benefits for the Committee to defer or refuse it.
- Despite the statutory deadline of 31 July, they could defer a decision on the application and receive information regarding the monitor and manage scheme long before any appeal for non-determination was heard.
- The Committee were speculating on what they did not know would happen.
- A consultation that did not account for the views of those that took part in it was not a consultation.

In response to points in the debate, the Locum Planning Lawyer advised that deferral was only appropriate when it served a clear purpose and would need planning reasoning to support the decision.

Councillor Martin Prescott noted that some Members of the Committee were not clear on the monitor and manage programme as it had not been designed yet.

The Chair clarified that they were debating on a motion to grant permission rather than defer the application.

In response to points raised in the debate, the Team Leader Major Sites advised that the monitor and manage scheme was described in further detail in a Technical Note to the application, therefore, the Committee would need to expand on what the scheme would need if the application was deferred or rejected.

In response to points raised in the debate, the Senior Transport Policy Officer advised that:

- The Technical Note provided by the Applicant on the monitor and manage approach, dated May 2025, was a 20-page document was uploaded to the Planning Portal.
- It detailed framework for how the monitor and manage programme could work and the potential mitigations that could be used.
- The detail of the programme would be agreed with the Highways Authority as a planning condition.

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

RESOLVED: That application 24/02889/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the reasons and conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, with the removal of clause (A), the addition of Conditions 50 to 53 and related Informative, the amendments to Conditions 3 to 5, Condition 16, Condition 18, Condition 23, Condition 25, Condition 35, Condition 36, and the combining of Conditions 27 and 49, as follows:

‘Condition 50

All development shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted and approved Flood Risk Assessment (dated 6 December 2024), this includes all new residential dwellings to have a finished floor level raised a minimum of 300mm above any flood level and 150mm above the surrounding proposed ground level unless otherwise first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Condition 51

Prior to the commencement of development, construction drawings of the surface water drainage network, associated sustainable drainage components and flow control mechanisms and a construction method statement shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall then be constructed as per the agreed drawings, method statement, Flood Risk Assessment (dated 6 December 2024) and Technical Memorandum (dated 23 May 2025) and remaining in perpetuity for the lifetime of the development unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No alteration to the Page 3 Agenda Item 5 agreed drainage scheme shall occur without prior written approval from the Local Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and to comply with NPPF Policies of North Herts Council.

Condition 52

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of the maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details in perpetuity.

The Local Planning Authority shall be granted access to inspect the sustainable drainage scheme for the lifetime of the development. The details of the scheme to be submitted for approval shall include:

- I. a timetable for its implementation
- II. details of SuDS feature and connecting drainage structures and maintenance requirement for each aspect including a drawing showing where they are located.
- III. a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime. This will include the name and contact details of any appointed management company.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and ensure the flood risk is adequately addressed for each new dwelling and not increased in accordance with NPPF and Policies of North Herts Council.

Condition 53

Upon completion of the surface water drainage system, including any SuDS features, and prior to the first use of the development; a survey and verification report from an independent surveyor shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The survey and report shall demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the details approved pursuant to condition 51. Where necessary, details of corrective works to be carried out along with a timetable for their completion, shall be included for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any corrective works required shall be carried out in accordance with the approved timetable and subsequently re-surveyed with the findings submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the flood risk is adequately addressed, not increased and users remain safe for the lifetime of the development in accordance with NPPF and Policies of North Herts Council.

Informative

“For further advice on what we expect to be contained within the FRA and/ or a Drainage Strategy to support a planning application, please refer to the Validation List and Proforma on our surface water drainage webpage <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/water/surface-water-drainage/surface-water-drainage.aspx> this link also includes HCC’s Flood Risk Management policies on SuDS in Hertfordshire. We do expect the Validation List to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and LLFA to show you have provided all information and the Proforma to the LLFA to summarise the details of the proposed development.

Both FEH13 and FEH22 are currently accepted to support drainage modelling calculations. For the avoidance of doubt the use of FSR and FEH1999 data has been superseded and therefore, use in rainfall simulations are not accepted.”

Condition 3

“Highways

No development shall commence until full details (in the form of scaled plans and / or written specifications) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to illustrate the following:

- i. Roads, footways.
- ii. Cycleways.
- iii. Foul and surface water drainage.
- iv. Visibility splays
- v. Access arrangements
- vi. Parking provision in accordance with parking locations plan DES-716-110 Rev 3
- vii. Loading areas.
- viii. Turning areas.

Reason: To ensure suitable, safe and satisfactory planning and development of the site in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018). Page 5 Specified that parking provision shall be in accordance with the parking locations plan, which is in accordance with the Local Plan standards."

Condition 4

"Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the vehicular and active travel accesses shall be completed and thereafter retained as shown on Transport Assessment drawing numbers (PL101 Rev - , PL102 Rev - & PL103 Rev) in accordance with details/specifications to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the highway authority. Prior to use appropriate arrangements shall be made for surface water to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018)."

Condition 5

"Surface Water

Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, arrangement shall be made for surface water from the proposed development to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge onto the highway carriageway. Reason: To avoid the carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

Reason: To avoid the carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018)."

Condition 16

"Ecological Enhancements

No development shall take place until an Ecological Enhancement Plan (EEP) for the creation of new wildlife features such as hibernacula, the inclusion of integrated bird/bat and bee bricks, at a rate equivalent to one per unit, in buildings/structures and hedgehog holes in fences, as informed by the December 2024 Ecological Impact Assessment, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved Ecological Enhancement Plan shall be implemented on site.

Reason: To conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy NE4 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan 2011-2031."

Condition 18

"Fencing

Fencing Notwithstanding the approved plans, details of the proposed fencing along the western boundary (adjacent to the woodland) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented on site and permanently maintained.

Reason: In the interests of ecology and visual impact in accordance with Policies D1 and NE4 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan."

Condition 23

"Land contamination

Prior to any permitted dwelling being occupied a validation report shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate the effectiveness of any agreed Remediation Strategy (agreed under condition 22). Any such validation shall include responses to any unexpected contamination discovered during works.

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

Condition 25

"Noise

The development shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted plans including the noise mitigation scheme as set out in the submitted MEC Ltd noise assessment report dated March 2025 (25521-ENV-0402 Rev B).

Reason: In the interests of protecting living conditions of future occupiers in accordance with Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan 2011- 2031."

Condition 35

"EV charging points plan

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved details of siting, number and design of the Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall thereafter be installed prior to the occupation of each dwelling and permanently retained thereafter. Each of the proposed new dwellings shall have an Electric Vehicle (EV) charging point. Proposals should also be made for the provision of EV charging within other public parking areas of the proposed development.

Reason: To avoid obstruction of the footpaths and in the interests of good urban design/visual impact in accordance with Policy D1 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan 2011-2031."

Condition 36

"Cycle parking

No development shall commence until details of the cycle parking in accordance with DES-716-265-0 (Bins and Cycle Storage Plans and Elevations) and DES-716-110-3 Parking Location Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The cycle parking provision shown shall accord with the guidance in LTN 1/20 on Cycle Infrastructure Design as a minimum unless local cycle parking standards are greater. The development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, shall not be occupied until the cycle parking has been constructed and completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be kept free of obstruction and permanently available for the parking of cycles only.

Reason: To ensure the provision of cycle parking that meets the needs of occupiers of and visitors to the proposed development in compliance with the guidance in the Hertfordshire Place & Movement Planning and Design Guide and LTN1/20 on Cycle Infrastructure Design as a minimum, and in the interests of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies 1, 5 and 8 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018) and in the interests of good urban design/visual impact in accordance with Policy D1 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan 2011-2031.'

Condition 27

"Landscape Management Plan

No development above ground level shall take place until a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management Page 7 responsibilities and maintenance schedules and periods for all soft landscape areas (other than privately owned domestic gardens) together with a timetable for the implementation of the landscape management plan, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan shall cover the management and maintenance of all areas of open space (to include parks, greenways, play areas, informal open space, seminatural green space). Details to be submitted shall include:

- a) Management organisation;*
- b) Details of landscape management and maintenance plans;*
- c) Details of planting, grass cutting, weeding and pruning;*
- d) Management of sustainable urban drainage features;*
- e) Inspection, repair and maintenance of all hard landscaping and structures;*
- f) Management, monitoring and operational restrictions; and*
- g) Maintenance and planting replacement programme for the establishment period of landscaping.*

The landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable. The open spaces provided shall be retained for their intended purpose and in accordance with the approved management plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the longevity of the landscaping scheme and protect the visual amenity and character of the area, in accordance with Policies SP12, NE6 and GA1 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan 2011-2031.'

N.B. Following the conclusion of this item, there was a break in proceedings at 21.58 and the meeting reconvened at 22.08.

26 24/02455/FP LAND OPPOSITE WYMONDLEY GRID STATION AND TO THE SOUTH OF SPERBERRY HILL, ST IPPOLYTS, HERTFORDSHIRE

Audio recording – 3 hours 8 minutes 35 seconds

The Senior Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters within the Addendum to the report in respect of Application 24/02455/FP, as well as other updated matters relating to the application and advised that:

- The appeal lodged against the decision on the Wandon End Solar Farm application had been allowed following a Public Inquiry and planning permission had been granted.
- Wymondley Parish Council had written a second letter of objection in relation to a grey belt assessment document produced by the Applicant.
- Pre-commencement conditions had been agreed by the Applicant Agent.
- Green Belt Review categorisation of sub-parcel 10a within the report had been changed, however, the overall recommendation had not changed due to this carrying little weight.
- An updated list of conditions had been added to the recommendations, including the addition of a Construction Traffic Management Plan, and were detailed in the supplementary documents.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report in respect of Application 24/02455/FP supported by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Caroline McDonnell
- Councillor Mick Debenham

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

- There were similarities between this application and the one at Wandon End and the recent appeal decision could be used as guidance to inform their decision. However, the report for this application had been published before the outcome of the Public Inquiry and each application should be assessed individually on its own merits.
- Cumulative loss of the Green Belt within the district had not been directly addressed in the report but it detailed that the impact of the site would be limited against the part 3 consideration due to its scale and benefits.
- There were residential properties within view of the site, however, the impact of the development had been considered and mitigation measures would be put in place, such as enhanced boundary treatment and hedgerow planting.

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

- The approval of the application rested on whether the land would be designated as Grey Belt or Green Belt.
- They felt that the developer was taking advantage of the grey belt requirements outlined in the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG), particularly paragraph 7.
- In the 2016 Green Belt Review, one of the two fields in the application site was classified as making a strong contribution to the Green Belt purpose, particularly purposes A and B.
- This contribution applied at the granular level of sub-parcel 10a which covered a substantial part of the site and parcel 10 which covered the Langley Valley, a major part of the green belt gap between Stevenage and Hitchin.
- Applying paragraph 7 of the PPG precluded the Grey Belt land classification.

- The site at Wandon End was assessed by the Appeal Inspector as Grey Belt due to its moderate contribution to purpose A of the Green Belt, whereas this site gave a strong contribution to both purposes A and B.
- The Wandon End Appeal Inspector gave some weight to the 2016 Green Belt Review in their assessment of the application.
- This land had an even stronger case for contributing to the Green Belt as another solar farm in Wymondley had recently been granted permission.
- Granting permission for this application would erode the Green Belt further between Hitchin and Stevenage.
- If the Committee had any doubts about this application, they should defer it and evaluate the Green Belt value between Hitchin and Stevenage.
- The costs of the above would be far less than those of a flawed decision being challenged and the loss of Green Belt that would be felt by generations to come.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Parish Councillor Hobson for their presentation and invited the second Public Objector, Wymondley Parish Councillor Paul Harding to speak against the application. Councillor Harding thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The narrow and strategic gap between Hitchin and Stevenage was under pressure by both housing and renewable infrastructure.
- No mention was made of the land that was safeguarded for development at Stevenage West in the report of the Senior Planning Officer which should be protected by the Green Belt.
- Land west of the A1 (M) had already been granted planning permission for a 1300-dwelling development with access routes into the safeguarded land and consequently, the 1km gap quoted in the report of the Senior Planning Officer would be approximately 100 metres after development had taken place.
- Development on the edge of Hitchin would result in continuous urban influence extending close to the western boundary of the site.
- The site was measured at 1.5km in length and would lead to a perceived narrowing of the gap between Stevenage and Hitchin, adding to their coalescence both physically and functionally and providing a strong case for its designation to the Green Belt.
- The cumulative impact of WY1, North Stevenage developments and solar farm already granted permission in Wymondley would be immense on the strategic gap.
- The area contained open, rolling, arable land with views to the skyline and the panels would produce a hard, reflective grid visible from the Hertfordshire Way.
- If the application was granted permission, nearby residents would be surrounded by an industrial fenced environment resulting from this and the aforementioned developments.
- A reduction in resident wellbeing resulting from the cumulative impacts of these developments should carry significant weight when considering this application.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Parish Councillor Harding for their presentation and invited the third Public Objector, Mr Andy Hammond to speak against the application. Mr Hammond thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- They lived adjacent to the proposed site and operated a vineyard on its southern edge.
- The application presented was mostly the same as the one that the Council overwhelmingly refused eighteen months ago.
- Unacceptable harm to the Green Belt and rural landscape remained valid as a reason to refuse to grant permission for this application.

- The site lay within the Green Belt and was comprised of Grade 2 and 3a agricultural land, which was designated as best and most versatile under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and produced approximately 200 tonnes of wheat each year, contributing to local and national food security.
- Development on such land should only occur in exceptional cases as per the NPPF.
- This application was not in isolation with permission granted for solar farms at Great Wymondley, Wandon End and Bygrave, which together with approved housing developments would cause a dramatic erosion of the countryside.
- Serious objections had been submitted from key consultees such as Natural England, Place Services, the Planning Consultant, Conservation, St Ippolyts Parish Council and Wymondley Parish Council whose input deserved real weight in the considerations of the Committee.
- Construction was expected to last up to a year and operate seven days a week which would cause disruption, noise, dust and traffic to a quiet rural community.
- Local roads were already narrow and pressured and mitigations should be implemented to restrict working days, ensure a robust Construction Traffic Management Plan and have environmental oversight if permission was granted.
- The development also presented a risk to local ecology and adjoining land.
- Flooding, habitat loss and microclimate changes could all affect the viability of the vineyard and they had received no consultation from the Applicant.
- The community gained nothing from the proposal as contractors were from outside the area, there would be no discounted energy schemes, job creation was negligible, and the only benefactors were the landowner, developer and investors.
- They were not in opposition to renewable energy, but in favour of balanced development.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Mr Hammond for his presentation and invited the Member Advocate Objector, Councillor Ralph Muncer to speak against the application. Councillor Muncer thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- Grey Belt was in its infancy and this site was classified under it, but Members of the Committee could be confident that it was part of the Green Belt.
- The value of this land within the Green Belt allocation was quite clear and it had been designated to prevent urban sprawl between Stevenage and Hitchin as detailed in the adopted Local Plans of both North Herts and Stevenage Borough Councils.
- This land helped to preserve the character of North Herts and the nearby villages of Gosmore, St Ippolyts, Little Wymondley and Great Wymondley.
- Approximately 150 hectares in North Herts had been approved for solar farm development in the last year which was already a significant contribution towards generating renewable energy that would help to fight climate change.
- The development would impact on food security as the agricultural quality of this site was in the upper half of the agricultural land classification.
- While access to the site would be minimal once the solar farm had been constructed, there was significant concern over access during the construction phase as this would take place via single track country lanes without providing mitigations such as passing places to prevent the worsening of congestion on Sperberry Hill and Little Almshole Lane.
- Contributions would not be felt by the local community despite the disruption it would cause to them.
- Based on the arguments that had been presented, Members had grounds to reject the application.
- If the application was not rejected, it should be deferred as the report of the Senior Planning Officer was in his opinion, fundamentally flawed and should be revised to

include an assessment of the whole site so that Members had accurate information to base their determination on.

There were no points of clarification from Members.

The Chair thanked Councillor Muncer for his presentation and invited the Applicant Representative, Mr Nick Roberts to speak in support of the application. Mr Roberts thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The proposed solar farm would generate renewable energy and displace fossil fuel generation, contributing positively towards climate change.
- North Herts Council declared a climate emergency in 2019 and had committed to becoming Net Zero by 2040, which this application would support.
- The previous recommendation to refuse the application in November 2023 was described as 'very finely balanced'.
- Since its refusal, they had improved the application by reducing its land area and the number of solar panels while retaining the energy generation capacity.
- They had also increased the stand off from existing properties and planted 3,000 square metres of new woodland.
- The balance now rested in favour of supporting the application as not only had it improved, but national policy on the Green Belt had also fundamentally changed in a way that provided greater support to the application.
- Analysis of grey belt policy by the Senior Planning Officer was correct as only the site within its boundaries should be given significant weight, not pre-existing green belt assessments on large parcels of land.
- To deliver Net Zero in North Herts, there would need to be over 750 hectares of new solar developments, invalidating the opinion that the district had already made its contribution towards renewable energy generation.
- The largest hurdle to the delivery of renewable energy was sufficient grid connection points.
- This site benefitted from a committed connection to the national grid through Wymondley Sub-Station and could begin generating renewable energy in advance of the 2030 Net Zero target set by the UK Government.
- The application should be granted permission as the Council would be delivering an improved scheme that helped to ensure environmental targets were met.

In response to a point of clarification from Councillor Mick Debenham, the Applicant Representative advised that works would take place seven days a week but with reduced hours on Saturdays and Sundays and no noise generating activities or vehicular deliveries would be carried out on Saturday afternoons or Sundays.

In response to points raised by the public speakers, the Senior Planning Officer advised that:

- The NPPF defined Grey Belt as any land that did not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes A, B or D in paragraph 143.
- Grey Belt excluded land that possessed areas or assets of particular importance as detailed in Footnote 7 of the NPPF (other than Green Belt) that would provide a strong reason for refusal.
- These assets were listed as important habitat sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, local green space, national landscapes and parks, Heritage Coasts, and designated heritage assets.
- The detailed assessment associated with Grey Belt classification had been carried out on this site.
- Very limited weight was given to the 2016 Green Belt Review as its purpose was to assess Green Belt boundaries that covered a much wider portion of land whereas the

Grey Belt assessment focused on the application site, making it more relevant and giving it greater weight.

- The agricultural land within the site was categorised as Grade 3a and Grade 2, however, National Policy Statement EM3 for renewable energy infrastructure stated that ground mounted solar arrays did not need to be prohibited on agricultural land and farming would still take place through sheep grazing.
- After 40 years, the solar farm would be decommissioned and the land returned to its current use.
- Construction traffic and its on-site working hours would be controlled through the Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- Environmental Health could also control working hours through separate legislation.

The following Members asked additional questions:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Steve Jarvis
- Councillor Caroline McDonnell

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

- The agricultural land quality was recognised but as previously detailed, it would not be lost as it would be used for grazing if permission was granted.
- The comments from the Police Architectural Liaison Officer were in relation to the monitoring of CCTV within the site and the inability to prevent crime, but the Applicant had provided measures in response to this.
- There would be three access routes to the site, one via Stevenage Road to the north and two from Little Almshole Lane.
- S106 contributions were not required as part of the application, therefore they could not ask the Applicant for funds to improve nearby roads.
- The Construction Traffic Management Plan would set out delivery routes, delivery management methods, phasing, access methods and vehicle routing to address congestion and other issues during the temporary construction phase.
- After the site had been constructed, traffic should return to normal levels.
- Highways would have to assess whether the delivery vehicles described in the Construction Traffic Management Plan were appropriate for the nearby roads.
- Harm to the site arising from visual impact had been identified, however, they deemed that the benefits resulting from the significant biodiversity net gain and generation of renewable energy would outweigh this.
- The net biodiversity gain from this site was large as its current biodiversity was low due to its current agricultural use for growing crops.

In response to additional questions, the Team Leader Major Sites advised that:

- Even under the most ambitious scenario, solar farms would occupy less than 1% of agricultural land nationally, therefore they were not a threat to food security as evidenced by the Inspector of the Wandon End Appeal.
- The parameters and methodology of the Green Belt assessment were outdated whereas the PPG gave clear instructions on what contributed to each of the Green Belt purposes when undertaking a Grey Belt Assessment.
- The Wandon End site was immediately adjacent to an urban setting whereas this site was not, therefore, different criteria had to be considered when weighing its contribution to urban expansion.
- As stated in the PPG, a strong contribution to an urban setting was defined as an area that contributed strongly to the merging of towns or villages, was likely to be free of

existing development, formed a substantial part of a gap between towns, and the development would result in visual separation between towns.

- A moderate contribution was defined as forming a small part of the gap between towns, development was able to take place without loss of visual separation between towns and could be but not limited to the presence and close proximity of structures, natural landscapes, elements or topography that preserved visual separation.
- Weak or no contribution was defined as an area that did not contribute to a gap between towns or formed a very small part of a gap without contributing to visual separation.
- Once an application was approved in a gap between settlements, subsequent proposals were to be assessed on much of the remaining gap(s) they would form which was done on a case-by-case basis.
- The developer would have to set out the number of daily construction vehicles including their size at each stage of the development within the Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- If the Highways Authority felt that construction vehicles would cause material harm to nearby roads, they could refuse to approve the details of the plan.

Councillor Caroline McDonnell proposed to defer the application to ensure that the grey belt classification of the land was correct and this was seconded by Councillor Martin Prescott.

In response to the proposal to defer, the Locum Planning Lawyer advised that:

- This was not a valid reason to defer the application as officers had already assessed and confirmed the classification of the site as Grey Belt and this would remain the same if another review of the site was carried out.
- Officers could answer more questions on the land classification, but deferring the application to a future meeting would not yield substantially new information to inform their decision.

In response to the proposal to defer, the Team Leader Major Sites advised that:

- The officer recommendation to grant permission would not change if Members considered the land to be Green Belt rather than Grey Belt as there was already a section in the report detailing the special circumstances that would outweigh the cumulative harm of the application if the land was considered to be Green Belt.
- If the application was deferred, information provided to Members at a future meeting would not be materially different than what had already been provided.

In response to points raised by Councillor Martin Prescott, the Locum Planning Lawyer advised that:

- Members needed to provide a legal reason to defer the application.
- It had already been detailed that little information other than the reports that had already been provided to Members would be presented to the Committee at a future meeting if the application was deferred. Therefore, Members should specify what information they had not seen already that would be required at the next meeting to help them inform their decision.

In response to the advice from the Locum Planning Lawyer, Councillor Martin Prescott noted that:

- Members could challenge the subjective view of the Senior Planning Officer following the public presentations at the meeting, and the discussion between Members on the matter.
- Officers were in a better position to interpret the reasons that Members had given to refuse the application and provide legal justifications to back them.

- He was uncomfortable with accepting the downgrade of the land from Green Belt to Grey Belt considering its high agricultural value.
- There were alternatives to this proposal to achieve net biodiversity gain such as the current owner of the land planting wildflower seeds.

Councillor Ian Mantle highlighted that the Committee had enough information before them not to defer the application and that they would not receive any meaningful information to help inform their decision at a future meeting if it was deferred.

In response to a question from Councillor Caroline McDonnell, the Team Leader Major Sites advised that refusal could not be made on the categorisation of sub-parcel 10a or the Green Belt Review as they were not relevant to the site itself and could be open to cost award at an appeal.

Councillor Martin Prescott noted that given the lack of reasons to defer the application, they should refuse the application.

Councillor Caroline McDonnell withdrew her motion to defer the application and this was accepted by Councillor Martin Prescott as seconder.

Councillor Caroline McDonnell proposed to refuse permission and this was seconded by Councillor Martin Prescott.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Steve Jarvis
- Councillor Mick Debenham
- Councillor Dave Winstanley
- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Bryony May

The following points were made as part of the debate:

- The report identified that there would be a significant visual impact from the solar farm that would not arise from other sites that were capable of meeting renewable energy needs, therefore the application should be refused.
- The site was adjacent to the sub-station which was described as an eyesore.
- The current farmer of the land did not want to grow crops.
- It had good connection to the national grid via the sub-station with minimal amounts of nearby housing, showing its appropriateness for a solar farm.
- There would be a large biodiversity net gain and fewer pesticides would be used if the land no longer produced crops.
- The downgrade of the land classification from Green Belt to Grey Belt was concerning.
- The site would be plugging the gap between Hitchin and Stevenage.
- Biodiversity net gain could be achieved in a way that did not involve solar panels.
- Crops were shown in multiple pictures of the visual presentation given by the Senior Planning Officer, therefore, the argument that the farmer did not want to grow crops was not necessarily true.
- The land was classified under the Green Belt in the Local Plan but had been defined under the Grey Belt in this application.
- While this land was relatively appropriate for a solar farm, they might be in a weaker position to defend against inappropriate areas of development on Green Belt land in the Local Plan if permission was granted for this application.

In response to points raised in the debate, the Chair asked the proposer to clarify the grounds for refusing the application.

As her right of reply, Councillor Caroline McDonnell made the following points:

- There were issues with the land categorisation as Grey Belt and it should be kept as Green Belt land.
- The buffer between Hitchin and Stevenage should be maintained.
- Hitchin, Gosmore and St Ippolyts were all close together.
- The solar farm would border a housing development on Sperberry Hill that had already been approved by the Council and the proposal to mitigate this through the planting of trees would close off the area completely.
- The visual impact on landscape and openness would be massive as it would be visible from numerous miles around.
- There would be other sites in North Herts more suitable than this one for a solar farm.
- The proposed solar farm at Priory Farm in Great Wymondley was located several miles from the nearest sub-station which meant that putting the solar farm on an alternative site to this one, further away from the sub-station was possible.

In response to points made by Councillor Caroline McDonnell, the Team Leader Major Sites summarised the material reasons for refusal as the contribution of the site to the restriction of urban sprawl and merging of settlements and as such, the site was considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Furthermore, the development would have an impact on the landscape. These were accepted by Councillor McDonnell.

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

Councillor Dave Winstanley proposed to grant permission and this was seconded by Councillor Ian Mantle.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Steve Jarvis
- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Mick Debenham
- Councillor Nigel Mason

The following points were made as part of the debate:

- There was difficulty in granting permission as the implications of the Grey Belt assessment might go beyond this application.
- Members of the Committee should interpret the policy on Grey Belt rather than define it.

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

RESOLVED: That Application 24/02455/FP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to the reasons and conditions set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager, with the amendments to Condition 4, Condition 9, Condition 12, Condition 14, Condition 16, Condition 18, Condition 24, Condition 25 and Condition 27, the removal of Condition 10 and 11 and the addition of Condition 29, as follows:

‘Condition 4

No development approved by this planning permission shall take place (including ground works or vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) should be informed by the 2024 Ecological Assessment and a pre-construction badger survey and include the following.

- a) *Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.*
- b) *Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".*
- c) *Practical measures to avoid or reduce impacts during construction.*
- d) *The location and timing of sensitive works to harm to biodiversity features.*
- e) *The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.*
- f) *Responsible persons and lines of communication.*
- g) *The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.*
- h) *Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.*
- i) *The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.*

Reason: To minimise the impact of the construction process on the biodiversity and ecology of the site, in line with Policy NE2 and NE4 of the Local Plan.

Condition 9

A) No development approved by this permission shall take place/commence until an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and in accordance with the programme of work as set out in the Archaeological Brief (P01/22/0709/3). 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 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 ensure the implementation of an appropriate archaeological investigation, recording, reporting and publication, and the protection and preservation of archaeological features of significance, in accordance with North Hertfordshire Local Plan Policy HE4 and Section 16 of the NPPF 2024.

Condition 12

No development approved by this permission shall take place until a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) for the vehicle access proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. Thereafter the recommendations, if any, shall only be carried out in accordance with the report.

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan 4 (adopted 2018).

Condition 14

All development shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted and approved Flood Risk Assessment (December 2021) and Drainage Strategy (dated 22 October 2024, REF 14855), plus any updates as required by Condition 7 unless otherwise first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Condition 16

Upon completion of the surface water drainage system, including any SuDS features, and prior to the first use of the development; a survey and verification report from an independent surveyor shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The survey and report shall demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed in accordance with the details approved pursuant to condition 7. Where necessary, details of corrective works to be carried out along with a timetable for their completion, shall be included for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any corrective works required shall be carried out in accordance with the approved timetable and subsequently re-surveyed with the findings submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the flood risk is adequately addressed, not increased and users remain safe for the lifetime of the development in accordance with NPPF and Policies of North Herts Council.

Condition 18

No development approved by this permission shall take place until a landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The content of the LEMP shall include the following.

- a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.*
- b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.*
- c) Aims and objectives of management.*
- d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.*
- e) Prescriptions for management actions.*
- f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).*
- g) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.*
- h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.*

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To enhance biodiversity including any species and their habitats and in accordance with the NPPF and Policies NE4, NE12 and SP12 in the Local Plan.

Condition 24

No development approved by this permission shall take place until a Soil Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The soil management plan shall include:

- a) Measures to protect soils during development with reference to the guidance found in Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites;*
- b) A works programme showing how all soil handling and trafficking operations will be undertaken and which makes allowance for poor weather/ ground conditions stoppages;*
- c) Details of how construction activities will be managed across the site to minimise impact on soils; and*
- d) Details of appropriate equipment and methods for stockpiling, resspreading and ameliorating of soil compaction in accordance with good practice techniques to minimise the risk of soil compaction.*

Reason: To protect soil quality and so enable the reinstatement of its agricultural land quality following the cessation of the solar farm use of the land in accordance with the NPPF, Defra Guidance and policy NE12 in the Local Plan.

Condition 25

Within the first planting season following the completion of construction works, the approved landscaping and biodiversity proposals to be approved shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the appearance of the completed development and the visual amenity of the locality in accordance with policies NE4, NE12 and SP12 in the Local Plan.

Condition 27

Prior to the installation of any CCTV cameras, details of measures to restrict the camera movements around the boundary of the application site to prevent viewing towards residential properties shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the CCTV cameras shall be installed and retained in perpetuity in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to protect the privacy of adjacent residential properties in accordance with Policy D3 of the Local Plan.

Condition 29

Before commencement of the development, a 'Construction Traffic Management Plan' shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan. The 'Construction Traffic Management Plan' must set out:

- *the phasing of construction and proposed construction programme.*
- *the methods for accessing the site, including wider construction vehicle routing. Page 21*
- *the numbers of daily construction vehicles including details of their sizes, at each phase of the development.*
- *the hours of operation and construction vehicle movements.*
- *details of any highway works necessary to enable construction to take place.*
- *details of construction vehicle parking, turning and loading/unloading arrangements clear of the public highway.*
- *details of any hoardings and how visibility splays will be maintained.*
- *management of traffic to reduce congestion.*
- *control of dirt and dust on the public highway, including details of the location and methods to wash construction vehicle wheels.*
- *the provision for addressing any abnormal wear and tear to the highway. waste management proposals.*
- *Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities;*
- *Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway;*
- *where works cannot be contained wholly within the site a plan should be submitted showing the site layout on the highway including extent of hoarding and remaining road width for vehicle movements.*

Reason: To minimise the impact of the construction process on the on local environment and local highway network in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).'

The meeting closed at 11.39 pm

Chair