

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE PLEASE NOTE
THAT THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD
VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. ON WEDNESDAY 17
JUNE 2020, AT 7.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor B Deering (Chairman)
Councillors D Andrews, R Buckmaster,
B Crystall, J Dumont, A Huggins, J Jones,
I Kemp, T Page, C Redfern, P Ruffles and
T Stowe

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Fiona Dunning	- Principal Planning Consultant
Peter Mannings	- Democratic Services Officer
Sara Saunders	- Head of Planning and Building Control
Victoria Wilders	- Legal Services Manager

51 APOLOGY

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor Beckett. It was noted that Councillor Dumont was substituting for Councillor Beckett.

52 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed Members and the Public to

the meeting and introduced the Members and Officers who were present on Zoom.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Head of Planning and Building Control referred to recent Member concern regarding the lack of pooled developer contributions towards healthcare provision. She said that Members had been particular concerned about pooled contributions towards acute care, mental health and community care.

Members were reminded that it had not been possible to secure contributions without the appropriate justification. Officers had been investigating what could be done to improve the levels of provision by writing to contacts at the East and North Herts Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

The Committee was advised that a positive response had been received from the CCG in respect of working towards improving overall provision. The Leader had also raised this issue with the East of England Local Government Association (LGA) and the Hertfordshire Infrastructure Planning Partnership.

The Head of Planning and Building Control said that, as regards the Committee's decision to approve the planning application on Land to the East Herts of Stevenage in February 2020, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government had decided not to call in this application for a decision. Members were advised that the decision of the Secretary of State not to call in the application was very good news. The Chairman said it was very pleasing to know that the

approach of Officers in dealing with this application had been judged to be sound.

53 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

54 MINUTES - 29 APRIL 2020

Councillor Huggins proposed and Councillor Buckmaster seconded, a motion that the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 April 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 394 – delete in last sentence, 12th paragraph – ‘weigh’.

Replace with ‘...outweigh’.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 April 2020, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 394 – delete in last sentence, 12th paragraph – ‘weigh’.

Replace with ‘...outweigh’.

- 55 3/19/0226/FUL - DEMOLITION OF DWELLING AT NO. 125 DUNMOW ROAD AND RELOCATION AND WIDENING OF THE EXISTING CROSSOVER TO CREATE A NEW ACCESS ROAD TO THE LAND TO THE REAR CONSISTING OF THE REAR SECTION OF GARDENS OF 123-127 DUNMOW ROAD TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF 9 NEW HOUSES ON THE LAND TO THE REAR AND A RELOCATED REPLACEMENT DWELLING FOR NO. 125 DUNMOW ROAD AT 123 - 127 DUNMOW ROAD
-

The Head of Planning and Building Control recommended that in respect of application 3/19/0226/FUL, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report now submitted.

The Principal Planning Officer, on behalf of the Head of Planning and Building Control, detailed a number of points that she intended to clarify for Members including the matter of a contribution towards sustainable transport in the form of a cycle route along Parsonage Lane.

Members were advised that the application had been amended at the request of Officers and the proposed development was now for the demolition of an existing dwelling and the erection of 9 terraced dwellings to the rear and 1 detached dwelling to the front of the site. The detached dwelling would replace the demolished dwelling resulting in 9 new dwellings on this site.

The Principal Planning Officer referred to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations and

the tests that had to be met before contributions could be requested by a Council. She said that the tests were whether the application was acceptable in planning terms, whether the CIL or Section 106 contributions were directly related to the development and whether the contributions were related in scale and kind to the development.

Members were advised that these tests had not been met and there were therefore no Section 106 contributions included in the recommendation. The Officer said that the local validation list adopted in March 2019 stipulated that a sustainability appraisal was required for all planning applications.

The Principal Planning Officer said that this scheme was submitted before the local validation list had been adopted and the delay had been due to Officers working with the applicant to resolve issues that had arisen as the application was being assessed by the Authority.

The Principal Planning Officer said that a number of sustainability measures were proposed including sustainable drainage, permeable paving and water butts on the site. Members were advised that these and other measures were proposed in addition to the building regulations requirements for sustainability.

The Principal Planning Officer detailed the location of the site and summarised the nature of the nearby dwellings and their relationship to the proposed development. She also referred to landscaping and detailed the location of an electricity substation that

adjoined the site. A noise assessment had been submitted with the scheme and a proposed condition had been included in the report.

Members were advised that the noise assessment had suggested an increase in the boundary fence to 3 metres in order to overcome an issues with noise for the nearest adjoining property. It was worth noting that this property had no windows that faced the electricity substation.

The Officer detailed the access way and the proposed footpath from Dunmow Road. She also summarised the proposed layout and appearance of the proposed dwellings. Members were shown the site line visibility splays and were advised that, following a lot of work with Hertfordshire Highways, Officers were now satisfied with the proposals in that respect.

The Principal Planning Officer concluded by referred to paragraph 7.1 for the comments from neighbours and their concerns on the original application and the amended plans. Members were reminded that the application was recommended for approval subject to a number of conditions and some pre commencement conditions.

Mr Hoodless addressed the Committee in support of the application. Councillor Page commented on issues regarding the concerns of Hertfordshire Crime Prevention and referred to the comments of UK Power Networks in terms of whether their concerns related to noise from national grid equipment or other safety considerations.

Councillor Page said that the response from the Landscape Advisor on the planning portal was quite strongly negative and in the report this was only mentioned in terms of some concern rather than strongly negative. Councillor Dumont questioned whether the comments of the public speaker in respect of affordable housing were fact or an opinion.

Councillor Jones said that the electricity sub-station was 4 to 5 metres from the nearest residents with a proposed 3 metre or 6 foot fence. He expressed concerns regarding the proximity of the equipment to dwellings and asked for input from Officers as to whether this constituted back land development.

The Principal Planning Officer said that the access issue was the passage of the access way was adjoining the rear garden of the detached dwelling. She said that a condition had been applied for further information to be submitted in respect of methods to prevent fence jumping in order to break into a property.

Members were advised that the points raised in respect of the substation were in relation to a noise assessment and the views of Environmental Health and there were no issues in terms of safety. The Officer said that District Plan policy DES3 referred to compensatory planting where trees were to be removed. The new native trees would be replacing trees that were in a poor condition. She also confirmed that there was no affordable housing as no Section 106 agreement had been required due to there

being fewer than 10 new dwellings proposed.

The Principal Planning Officer said although two gardens were being lost and this scheme could be classed as back land development, when viewed from Dunmow Road it would not appear as such due to the generous access arrangements.

Councillor Huggins made a brief comment in respect his concerns regarding noise due to the distance between dwellings and the electricity equipment.

Councillor Crystall made a number of positive comments regarding this being a smart design. He expressed concerns regarding the lack of a safe permanent play area or a bike store. He commented on whether bird boxes for nesting could be provided until the newer trees reached maturity.

Councillor T Page expressed concerns that the landscaping proposals failed to allow sufficient space for the opening of car doors or space for the planting of trees. The Officer confirmed that she was not concerned based on the proposed development in terms of landscaping and she highlighted that the access was sufficiently wide for landscaping. Residents would also be able to enjoy the amenity of their front and rear gardens.

The Principal Planning Officer said that the kitchens of the proposed dwellings overlooked the potential shared space and she believed that the applicant would be amenable to the provision of bird boxes on the site. She reiterated that some trees were being

retained, particular to the rear of the site. Hedgerows and some landscaping also existed in the adjoining industrial areas.

Councillor Kemp suggested that the impact of the application would be modest and he was pleased to see that some trees would be retained. He referred to residents' concerns in respect of increased traffic. Following a further point from Councillor Page regarding noise attenuation, the Principal Planning Officer referred to condition 8 in terms of noise. She further stated that the noise consultant had been very thorough on this scheme.

Councillor Kemp proposed and Councillor Crystall seconded, a motion that application 3/19/0226/FUL be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report now submitted. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that in respect of application 3/19/0226/FUL, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report now submitted.

56 ITEMS FOR REPORTING AND NOTING

RESOLVED – that the following reports be noted:

- (A) Appeals against refusal of planning permission / non-determination;
- (B) Planning Appeals lodged;

(C) Planning Appeals: Inquiry and Informal Hearing Dates

(D) Planning Statistics.

The meeting closed at 7.59 pm

Chairman

Date