

Public Document Pack

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER - DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES, GERONON ROAD, LETCHWORTH, SG6 3JF
ON TUESDAY, 21ST APRIL, 2026 AT 7.00 PM

MINUTES

Present: *Councillors: Nigel Mason (Chair), Emma Fernandes (Vice-Chair), Clare Billing, Ruth Brown, Ian Mantle, Bryony May, Caroline McDonnell, Louise Peace, Martin Prescott, Daniel Allen (In place of Dave Winstanley) and Mick Debenham (In place of Val Bryant).*

In Attendance: *Paul Chaston (Senior Planning Officer), Sam Dicocco (Principal Planning Officer), Robert Filby (Trainee Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), Jamie Graham (Democratic Services Apprentice), Shaun Greaves (Development and Conservation Manager), Sarah Kasparian (Senior Planning Officer), James Lovegrove (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Manager), Christella Menson (Conservation and Planning Enforcement Team Leader) and Nazneen Roy (Locum Planning Lawyer).*

Also Present: *At the commencement of the meeting approximately 17 members of the public, including registered speakers.*

163 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Audio recording – 1 minute 12 seconds

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Val Bryant, Tom Tyson and Dave Winstanley.

Having given due notice, Councillor Mick Debenham substituted for Councillor Bryant and Councillor Daniel Allen substituted for Councillor Winstanley.

164 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

Audio recording – 1 minute 37 seconds

There was no other business notified.

165 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Audio recording – 1 minute 40 seconds

- (1) The Chair advised that, in accordance with Council Policy, the meeting would be recorded.
- (2) The Chair drew attention to the item on the agenda front pages regarding Declarations of Interest and reminded Members that, in line with the Code of Conduct, any Declarations of Interest needed to be declared immediately prior to the item in question.
- (3) The Chair clarified matters for the registered speakers.
- (4) The Chair confirmed the procedure for moving to debate on an item.

- (5) The Chair advised that Section 4.8.23(a) of the Constitution applied to the meeting.
- (6) The Chair confirmed the cut off procedure should the meeting proceed at length.

166 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Audio recording – 3 minutes 55 seconds

The Chair confirmed that the registered speakers were in attendance.

167 25/02401/OP LAND SOUTH OF TURNPIKE LANE, ICKLEFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE

Audio recording – 4 minutes 29 seconds

N.B. Councillor Louise Peace declared an interest as Member Advocate Objector and moved to the public speaking gallery.

The Senior Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters relating to Application 25/02401/OP and advised that:

- S106 requests had been received from Ickleford Parish Council, which had been published with the supplementary documents.
- The recommendations should be amended to include the provision of delegated powers to the Development and Conservation Manager to review the S106 requests and agree payment for any Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) compliant requests.
- The Applicant had circulated a briefing note directly to Members, and this was available to view on the Council website.
- A new neighbour representation had been received, which provided neutral comments and did not raise any new issues that had not been addressed in the report.

The Senior Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of Application 25/02401/OP accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Daniel Allen
- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Mick Debenham
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Caroline McDonnell
- Councillor Nigel Mason

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

- Horses grazed on the land, but the space was not used for agriculture.
- There was approximately 70 metres between the most southern point of the site and the Hitchin settlement boundary.
- The report concluded that the site was classified under the Green Belt despite the Applicant making a submission that the land was Grey Belt.
- Keeping the southern half of the site free of built form carried significant weight in favour of the application under the Green Belt Assessment.
- On-site open space would be gained through this application as most of the site was currently inaccessible to the public.
- It was roughly 150 metres from the first dwelling on Old Hale Way to the last dwelling on Arlesey Road, although the nearest dwelling to Hitchin was likely to be in Ickleford Bury.

- An active travel pathway would run through the development and link the east and west sides of the site.

In response to questions, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- The Illustrative Masterplan would be a material planning consideration in any future reserved matters application, and a Master Compliance Statement would be required by recommended condition, but granting outline planning permission would not tie reserved matters to the Illustrative Masterplan.
- The extent of built form was set out in the submitted Parameter Plan, which would be an approve plan.
- This scale of development should be deliverable within 5 years, but it would depend on several factors including the approval of reserved matters.
- As it had been designated as Green Belt land in the Local Plan, the site would remain Green Belt until any Green Belt Review and new Local Plan determined otherwise.

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

- There would be 200 metres between the onsite developable area and the Hitchin settlement boundary, which was defined by the playing fields of The Priory School.
- The division between the north and south parts of the site indicated the stance of the Council on where the Green Belt and Grey Belt were separated.

The Chair invited the Public Objector, Ickleford Parish Councillor Kathy Goldie to speak against the application. They thanked the Chair for the opportunity and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- Ickleford was already suffering from overdevelopment, saturation of traffic, pollution and sewage overflow.
- The application would significantly harm the Green Belt, in addition to the open character and appearance of Ickleford, which would contradict the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- This development and others nearby would add to runoff water that was polluting the River Oughton.
- Serious flooding occurred onsite during storms as evidenced by photographs.
- The development would be unsustainable as it failed to offer a choice of transport modes, and more than 200 vehicles resulting from the development would bring danger to neighbours, road users and pedestrians on Turnpike Lane.
- Infrastructure in Ickleford and Hitchin, such as water networks, schools, hospitals, and dental and GP surgeries were insufficient and would not cope with the influx of new residents.
- Public transport was also inadequate to cater for commuting and school children.
- This development and others proposed would constitute roughly 600 homes, which would destroy the village and its boundary with Hitchin to the south.
- Ickleford had already contributed adequately to the five-year housing land supply and housing need would be better met through proper, planned developments.
- The Green Belt land should be protected from development to preserve and enhance the nature within the area and decrease pollution.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor Daniel Allen
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Nigel Mason

In response to points of clarification, the Parish Councillor Goldie advised that:

- Sewage overflow resulting from rain deluge had been reported in Laurel Way, Duncots Close and Lower Green, and had destroyed gardens and risen within homes.
- Flooding took place to the west of the site and photographs showed waterlogging on Bedford Road due to pipe blockages.
- Ickleford had a high water table and measurements for this application had been taken during a dry period in April the previous year.
- Anglian Water had not accounted for rain deluge in the area when accepting these new homes into their system.

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

- Officers involved with the application should be thanked for writing a comprehensive report and arranging a site visit for Members of the Committee.
- Delivery of 100 homes with 50% affordable housing carried significant weight, but even with the tilted balance applied, it was believed that the harms outweighed the benefits.
- The development was outside the Ickleford settlement boundary and contrary to Policy SP2 in the Local Plan, therefore, it would significantly harm the Green Belt.
- Ickleford already suffered from excessive traffic, and 492 vehicle movements generated by the development would push the mini roundabout on Arlesey Road to peak capacity during school pick up times.
- 3 crashes had been documented on Crash Maps at the roundabout on Bedford Road.
- There was no cycle infrastructure on Arlesey Road or Bedford Road to help cyclists access Hitchin.
- Site access would cause the loss of 6 mature trees on Turnpike Lane and the Tree Preservation Orders on those had not been considered.
- No reference to the River Oughton being a chalk stream had been made in the Drainage Strategy, and runoff from the attenuation basin would pollute this.
- The chalk stream had only been given local importance in the Ecology Report.
- Wildlife would be impacted by the 14.65% on-site biodiversity net loss, and further adverse ecological impacts had been detailed in the Ecology Report.
- Contrary to the report, there was no shortage of brownfield sites in Ickleford and Hitchin, and 199 dwellings could be built on sites allocated within the Local Plan, which would more than meet the housing need identified by the Ickleford Neighbourhood Plan.
- Approving a development on open land in the Green Belt would fail to encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land as described in the report.

In response to a point of clarification asked by Councillor Daniel Allen, Councillor Louise Peace advised that the Ecologist had confirmed that otter spray had been found in the area.

The Chair thanked Councillor Peace for their verbal presentation and invited the Public Supporter, Millie Dodd to speak in support of the application. They thanked the Chair for the opportunity to speak and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- They were the Account Director at Just Build Homes, who focused on reaching residents who did not typically engage with the planning consultation process.
- Just Build Homes had engaged with residents in the determination period of the application to hear why residents supported the application, and all responses received had been made available on the planning portal.

Tuesday, 21st April, 2026

- Reasons for supporting the application included tackling the housing crisis through the provision of affordable homes, and the creation of open green space with a playground that would create a community feel.
- Granting permission for this application would provide an opportunity for home ownership to existing residents of Ickleford.

In response to points of clarification asked by Councillor Martin Prescott, Ms Dodd advised that:

- Just Build Homes spoke on behalf of supporters for local house building as evening committee meetings were not accessible for most residents.
- They also worked on behalf of local authorities, developers and housing associations to provide more representation of community voices in the planning process.

In response to points of clarification asked by Councillor Martin Prescott, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that a public supporter did not have to live locally to be able to register to speak, and the assessment of planning consultation responses was based upon the content of the comments, rather than the number of responses.

In response to further points raised by Councillor Martin Prescott, the Locum Planning Lawyer advised that points of clarification should relate to points raised in the verbal presentation, rather than what the rights of the speaker were to speak at the Committee.

The Chair thanked the Ms Dodd for their verbal presentation and invited the Agent to the Applicant, Kathryn Ventham to speak in support of the application. They thanked the Chair for the opportunity to speak and provided the Committee with a verbal presentation, and highlighted the following:

- The recommendation to grant permission had been made due to very special circumstances as the benefits outweighed the adverse impacts of the application.
- Benefits of the application included the delivery of 100 homes, of which 50% would be affordable, which was 10% above policy requirement. Significant open space and a green route through the site connecting to existing developments would also be delivered
- The development would be enclosed on three sides by existing development and the water course to the south would provide a natural boundary.
- While substantial weight had been given to harm caused to the Green Belt, the site-specific circumstances showed that the benefits outweighed the harms.
- Built development had been contained to Grey Belt land and public access in the form of a park had been provided to make development acceptable in the Green Belt across the whole site.
- This development was of high-quality and would fit into the existing built form of Ickleford.
- Consultation responses had confirmed the suitable and sustainable location of the site, with only 30% being occupied by built development.
- Connection points at the site boundary with Ickleford Mill would ensure good connectivity between the two developments.
- £3.6M in financial contributions would be made in total.
- A significant contribution towards the delivery of affordable housing would be made by this site, and the collective benefits would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harms.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor Mick Debenham
- Councillor Martin Prescott

In response to points of clarification, Ms Ventham advised that:

- There would be a requirement to remove some trees near the site access, but the other trees would be retained, and additional tree planting would be investigated.
- They would anticipate the completion of the development by 2029 if the application was granted planning permission.

N.B. Following the conclusion of public speaking, Councillor Louise Peace left the Council Chamber for the remainder of the item.

Councillor Nigel Mason proposed to grant permission with the amendment suggested by the Senior Planning Officer in their verbal update, and this was seconded by Councillor Emma Fernandes.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Daniel Allen
- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Mick Debenham
- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Emma Fernandes
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Caroline McDonnell
- Councillor Nigel Mason

The following points were made as part of the debate:

- Delivery of 100 homes and 50% affordable housing would be of significant benefit.
- Allocated sites in the Local Plan should be built on first rather than speculative sites like this one.
- 70 metres was not very far to the nearest development and Ickleford would soon be swallowed by Hitchin if applications like this one continued to be granted permission.
- The benefits and harms of the application were finely balanced.
- This development was positive as it would provide green open space to the public without built development being in open view.
- Reserving the southern portion of the site for green space was positive and safeguarded Ickleford from being absorbed by Hitchin.
- The Applicant had put a lot of thought into the application and it would be of benefit to the community.
- There would be a loss of grazing fields and natural habitat at the southern end of the site as it would be landscaped.
- It was close in proximity to Laurel Way, which had reported sewage issues.
- Adding approximately 200 vehicles to Turnpike Lane was not desirable.

In response to additional questions from Councillor Martin Prescott, the Development and Conservation Manager advised that:

- It would not be appropriate to pre-judge decisions on any pending applications, and each application would be considered on its own merits. Therefore, granting planning permission on this application would not set a precedent for decisions on future applications.
- From memory, the Icknield Neighbourhood Plan detailed that there were roughly 884 dwellings in the village, which might exclude the Burford Grange development.

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

RESOLVED: That application 25/02401/OP be **GRANTED** planning permission subject to:

- a) The completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and the Applicant agreeing to extend the statutory period in order to complete the agreement if required; and
- b) Providing delegated powers to the Development and Conservation Manager to:
 - (i) Resolve outstanding matters and financial contributions including a late request from Ickleford Parish Council; and
 - (ii) Update conditions and informatives with minor amendments as required; and
- c) The conditions as set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manger.

N.B. Following the conclusion of the item, there was a break in proceedings. The meeting reconvened at 20:33 and Councillor Louise Peace returned to the Chamber.

168 26/00006/FP LAND TO NORTH OF, STEVENAGE ROAD, HITCHIN, HERTFORDSHIRE

Audio recording – 1 hour 30 minutes 26 seconds

The Principal Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters relating to Application 26/00006/FP and advised that:

- Councillor Ralph Muncer had submitted a letter of objection after the publication of the supplementary documents.
- St Ippolyts Parish Council had also submitted a letter of objection and an S106 request following the publication of the supplementary documents.
- The Applicant had submitted a new proposed site layout, tenure plan, drainage addendum, highways technical note and noise impact assessment, and had requested for these to replace the original documents.
- A request had also been made by the Applicant to extend the determination period of the application until 3 July 2026.

The Principal Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of Application 26/00006/FP accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Mick Debenham
- Councillor Daniel Allen

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

- The ownership of the gate and the road that would be used for site access were unknown, but it was that they were owned by Kingshott School.
- Affordable housing would be similar to market housing within the development and both their material distribution and form were similar.
- Non-vehicle routes would lead out of the site in multiple directions to various facilities and amenities around 1km away.

In response to questions, the Locum Planning Lawyer advised that ownership matters were not a material planning consideration as these would be between the Applicant and the road owner to discuss.

Tuesday, 21st April, 2026

The Chair invited the Representative for the Applicant, Mr Alun Evans 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:

- In their opinion, the planning application had been put forward for consideration too early, and they had politely submitted an extension request to the Council.
- The new documents put forward responded to comments from statutory consultees and offered technical reasoning and solutions to key parts of the scheme.
- The contribution of the site towards Purpose A in the Green Belt assessment was not evident as containment features surrounding the site would prevent sprawl.
- Grey belt development did not cause harm to the Green Belt, and this should be given material weight in determining the application.
- 50% affordable housing provided by the development should also be given significant weight.
- An accessible ecological buffer would be provided by the development.
- This application should be deferred or granted planning permission by the Committee.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Ian Mantle
- Councillor Louise Peace
- Councillor Daniel Allen

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

- They had not withdrawn the application due to the cost and the reputation of the Council to work proactively with developers.
- This was not an isolated development as it would have direct active travel links with Hitchin and amenities in proximity to the development.
- The development was a logical annex of Hitchin and Kingshott School played a critical role in providing outdoor sports facilities.
- The developer had an established record of working with housing associations, and discussions had already taken place with some over the 50% affordable housing that would be provided.
- Additional information submitted to the Council addressed the concerns raised by the Highways Authority, and they had also met with them to resolve site access issues.
- Additional mapping and topographical data taken as part of a detailed site survey demonstrated that flooding would not be a concern.
- Contrary to the report of the Principal Planning Officer, the site did not perform strongly to Purpose A of the Green Belt in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as there were strong containment features on each side that would restrict urban sprawl.

In response to points raised in the verbal presentation, the Principal Planning Officer advised that:

- The application had been processed in a particular way because of the reasons detailed in the supplementary documents.
- It was believed that the application could not improve the environmental conditions of the area as referenced in paragraph 39 of the NPPF.
- Key parts of the preapplication advice had been ignored by the Applicant in their application, therefore, Members were considering the application as it had been submitted.

Councillor Nigel Mason proposed to refuse permission and this was seconded by Councillor Martin Prescott.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Daniel Allen

The following points were made as part of the debate:

- The report and presentation from the Principal Planning Officer, in addition to the objections from the Lead Local Flood Authority and Highways Authority detailed sufficient reasons to refuse planning permission.
- North Hertfordshire needed homes, but not to the detriment of the local area.
- There was no argument for the site to be classified as Grey Belt.
- This application had multiple areas of concern relating to flooding, access and separation of housing types.

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

RESOLVED: That application 26/00006/FP be **REFUSED** planning permission for the reasons set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

169 25/02794/RM HIGHOVER FARM, HIGHOVER WAY, HITCHIN, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG4 0RQ

Audio recording – 2 hours 11 minutes 7 seconds

The Senior Planning Officer provided a verbal update on matters relating to Application 25/02794/RM and advised that:

- The most up-to-date Location Plan had been published with the supplementary documents.
- Tracking plans had not been agreed by the Highways Authority, therefore, an additional recommendation to provide delegated powers to the Development and Conservation Manager to finalise tracking plans in consultation with the Highways Authority was suggested.

The Senior Planning Officer then presented the report in respect of Application 25/02794/RM accompanied by a visual presentation consisting of plans and photographs.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Louise Peace
- Councillor Daniel Allen

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

- The condition relating to solar panels had already been discharged in a separate application and EV chargers were subject to a pre-occupation condition in a separate application.
- The application had not been considered by the Design Review Panel, but Urban Design Officers had commented on the application and the Applicant would have to adhere to the District Urban Design Code on any future applications submitted.
- Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) had already been agreed in consultation with the Local Lead Flood Authority in a separate application.

Tuesday, 21st April, 2026

- The main road running through the site would likely be adopted by the Highways Authority, and the two loop roads in the development had also been designed to be adoptable. However, cul de sacs were unlikely to be adopted.
- This phase of the development was denser than the next phase as it contained more flats rather than housing. However, 40% affordable housing would still be delivered across all phases for the site.
- A consultation response from the Green Space Team had not been received but a previous comment from them detailed that the Council no longer required dog litter bins to be provided. As such, there were enough litter bins without those to satisfy requirements, but the Green Space Team would be contacted about this anyway in due course.

The Chair invited the Representative for the Applicant, Mr Mark Osborn 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 application complied with the approved Design Code, the Strategic Masterplan Framework and the Phasing Strategy.
- They had worked closely with officers to discuss key design concerns, which had resulted in the amended plans in their current form.
- This phase focused on the eastern side of the site and would enable a permeable and legible development in anticipation of features delivered in the next phases.
- 40% affordable housing would be delivered, with a higher proportion of 1 and 2-bed flats as this phase contained the character area of The Avenue where height and density were needed as prescribed by the outline planning permission and Design Code.
- Most proposed dwellings in this phase would be 2 storeys and all proposed garages would be single storey.
- A large proportion of the open space and biodiversity net gain requirements had been included in this application at Hitchin Meadows and Dane Walk.
- Additional play on the way would be provided along the active travel corridor in the southern part of the site, which would link to a future pocket park in phase four.
- A variation of mixed density and design had been shown in the plans, and the development would reflect the character of the surrounding area.
- Much needed housing would be delivered for the district, and approval of this application would enable construction to begin this summer.

The following Members asked points of clarification:

- Councillor Clare Billing
- Councillor Daniel Allen
- Councillor Louise Peace

In response to points of clarification, the Mr Osborn advised that:

- They would be happy to engage with Hertfordshire Constabulary on Secured by Design in due course.
- Affordable and social housing would be equally distributed across the site.
- Heat pumps and solar panels would be on the affordable dwellings as this was a requirement.

In response to an additional question from Councillor Martin Prescott, the Senior Planning Officer advised that residents would have permitted rights to install solar panels on their roofs and many dwellings would have roofs appropriate for solar panel installation.

Councillor Nigel Mason proposed to approve reserved matters with the amendment suggested by the Senior Planning Officer in their verbal update, and this was seconded by Councillor Ruth Brown.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Ruth Brown
- Councillor Daniel Allen
- Councillor Ian Mantle

The following points were made as part of the debate:

- Lots of needs were addressed through this application.
- While it was preferred to see applications conform to the emerging Design Code, it was sufficiently compliant and they should approve this application without hesitation.
- It had been positive to see the development progress to this stage.
- Infrastructure such as public transport should be in place ahead of first occupancy.

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

RESOLVED: That application 25/02794/RM be **APPROVED** reserved matters subject to:

- a) Providing delegated powers to the Development and Conservation Manager to:
 - i) Update conditions and informatives with minor amendments as required; and
 - ii) Finalise the tracking plans in consultation with the Highways Authority; and
- b) The conditions as set out in the report of the Development and Conservation Manager.

170 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Audio recording – 2 hours 45 minutes 29 seconds

Councillor Nigel Mason proposed and Councillor Ruth Brown seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the Press and Public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that the following report will involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the said Act (as amended).

171 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT QUARTERLY REPORT - PART 2

N.B. This item was considered in private session and therefore no audio recording was available.

The Conservation and Planning Enforcement Team Leader presented the Information Note entitled 'Planning Enforcement Quarterly Report – Part 2', following which Members asked questions.

The Chair thanked the Conservation and Planning Enforcement Team Leader for their presentation.

172 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT QUARTERLY REPORT - PART 1

Audio recording – 3 hours 1 minute 3 seconds

The Conservation and Planning Enforcement Team Leader presented the Information Note entitled 'Planning Enforcement Quarterly Report – Part 1' and advised that:

- An enforcement notice had been served to 4C Sun Street for the alteration of fenestration within a conservation area.
- Breachwood Green had been served an enforcement notice for change of use of a car park in the Green Belt and the appeal on this had been dismissed. However, the enforcement notice had been served by the appellant, and another appeal had been submitted, which would be determined through the written representation procedure.
- An appeal had been made against the enforcement notice served to The George at Baldock, and this would be determined through a Public Inquiry.
- A listed building enforcement notice had been served to 19 Sollershott Hall for the installation of a trellis, and they were seeking compliance on this as there had been no appeal made.
- 96 High Street had been served an enforcement notice for installing UPVC windows on a listed building without authorisation, and they were also hoping for compliance on this.
- An appeal had been submitted on the enforcement notice served to The Barn at Tee Green, and this would be determined through written representations.
- An enforcement notice had been served to 31 Thatcher's End, and the appeal made against this would also be determined through written representations.
- Members would receive an update on the determination of those appeals at a future meeting.

The Chair and Councillor Ruth Brown put on record their thanks to the Planning Enforcement Team for their work.

The Chair also thanked the Vice-Chair and officers for supporting the Committee during the Civic Year, and thanked Members for their commitment and time dedicated to the Committee.

The meeting closed at 10.09 pm

Chair