

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE PLEASE NOTE
THAT THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD
VIRTUALLY ON ZOOM ON WEDNESDAY 9
SEPTEMBER 2020, AT 7.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor B Deering (Chairman)
Councillors T Beckett, R Buckmaster, S Bull,
B Crystall, R Fernando, J Kaye, I Kemp,
T Page, C Redfern, P Ruffles and T Stowe

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillors J Goodeve and C Wilson

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Steven King | - Finance Management Trainee |
| Peter Mannings | - Democratic Services Officer |
| Sara Saunders | - Head of Planning and Building Control |
| Jill Shingler | - Principal Planning Officer |
| David Snell | - Service Manager (Development Management) |
| Victoria Wilders | - Legal Services Manager |

152 APOLOGY

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor Andrews. It was noted that Councillor Bull was substituting for Councillor Andrews.

153 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed Members and the Public to the meeting and detailed the categories of attendee that were present at the online meeting. He introduced each Member and Officer in attendance at the meeting.

The Chairman said that the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 came into force on Saturday 4 April 2020 to enable councils to hold remote committee meetings during the Covid-19 pandemic period. This was to ensure local authorities could conduct business during this current public health emergency. This meeting of the Development Management Committee was being held remotely under these regulations, via the Zoom application and was being recorded and live streamed on YouTube.

154 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Buckmaster declared a personal interest in application 3/18/2735/FUL, on the grounds that she was a volunteer for two organisations which could benefit from the Section 106 agreement, in that she was Chairman of the SYPRC Committee which ran the

Bullfields Centre and was a volunteer for Sawbridgeworth Library.

Councillor Page declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in application 3/20/0245/FUL, on the grounds that the application was on land previously owned by Bishop's Stortford Golf Club, which would be involved in a proposed biodiversity mitigation area. He said that his wife was a member and a shareholder of Bishop's Stortford Golf Club. He was moved to a virtual break out room whilst this application was considered.

155 MINUTES - 15 JULY AND 12 AUGUST 2020

Councillor Ruffles proposed, and Councillor Buckmaster seconded, a motion that the Minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared CARRIED. Councillor Bull abstained from voting as he was not present at the meeting on 25 June 2020.

Councillor Beckett proposed, and Councillor Kemp seconded, a motion that the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 August 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared CARRIED. Councillor Crystall abstained from voting as he was not present at the meeting on 12 August 2020.

RESOLVED – that (A) the Minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2020, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman; and

(B) the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 August 2020, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

- 156 3/20/0245/FUL - ERECTION OF 61 DWELLINGS (INCLUDING 24 AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS) ACCESSED FROM MANOR LINKS, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED HIGHWAY WORKS, LANDSCAPING, ECOLOGICAL ENHANCEMENT WORKS, UTILITIES, DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE AND PARKING AT LAND EAST OF MANOR LINKS (BISH9), BISHOP'S STORTFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE
-

The Head of Planning and Building Control recommended that in respect of application 3/20/0245/FUL, planning permission be granted subject to a legal agreement and the conditions detailed in the report now submitted. It was also recommended that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control to finalise the detail of the legal agreement and conditions.

The Principal Planning Officer, on behalf of the Head of Planning and Building Control, drew Members' attention to the late representations summary and details of specific schemes for the Section 106 funding. Members were advised that these details should be added to the recommendation in respect of the Section 106 legal agreement.

The Principal Planning Officer said that not all of the

objections had been included in the report or the late representations as Officers only ever included a short summary of objections as these were available in full elsewhere. She said that the impact of the new driving range was not being considered as this was the subject of a separate planning application.

Members were advised of a request that all construction traffic be routed through the golf course. The Principal Planning Officer said that a condition requiring a construction and management plan was proposed as part of the application. She confirmed that it was not reasonable to condition access across the golf course as this was not within the ownership of the applicant and there was access directly to the site.

Members were advised that the two accesses would comprise two cul-de-sacs with a central small green area which contained a footpath link to allow access from one side of the development to the other. The Principal Planning Officer said that the two access ways were located between existing properties from Manor Links and would be adopted by the highway authority. The minor roads would be private and would be a shared surface and the proposed dwellings that backed onto the existing bungalows on Manor Links would also be bungalows.

The Principal Planning Officer said that the layout plan accorded with the site masterplan and she detailed the breakdown of the proposed housing mix. She also detailed the percentage of rental and shared ownership dwellings and the proposed locations of the tenure mix. She described the design as appropriate

to this location and said that there would be 66 percent shared ownership dwellings and 34 percent rental properties within the proposed 40% affordable housing.

Members were advised that the proposed designs were appropriate to this location and the bungalows had been designed so that all accommodation was on the ground floor with some limited usable loft space. The Officer said that some of these units had been redesigned so that loft conversion was less likely. She said that there should be no significant overlooking of the bungalows on Manor Links.

The Principal Planning Officer said that permitted development rights would be removed to prevent dormers or roof additions in future without planning permission. She highlighted a number of examples of street scene elevations and explained that this edge of town development would include some cycle parking and electric vehicle charging points.

The Principal Planning Officer said that adequate garden and amenity space and parking was proposed and the proposed number of units was not excessive for this site. She said that Hertfordshire Highways were satisfied with the development in terms of highway impact and Officers believed that there would be no overshadowing or overlooking as a consequence of this development.

Members were advised that appropriate levels of financial contributions were proposed towards infrastructure. The Principal Planning Officer said that

an off-site ecological area would lead to a net gain in biodiversity in accordance with policy. She said that this would be a sustainable form of development and the application was therefore recommended for approval subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 legal agreement and conditions.

Mr Stripling addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Mr Weedon spoke for the application. Councillor Wilson addressed the Committee as the local ward Member.

Councillor Ruffles asked for clarification as to which sections of highway would be adopted by the County Council. He welcomed the bungalows in this modern time and on this particular site they were very importantly positioned to protect the existing bungalows off site. He welcomed this addition to the housing stock in East Herts and asked whether removing permitted development rights was the only protection against these bungalows becoming something bigger or higher in future.

Councillor Stowe asked for some clarity regarding the floodplain as the Town Council had said the site was on floodplain and the Lead Local Flood Authority had said it was not. He asked whether the dwellings would be built above the last known level. He asked whether there would be a condition removing the permitted development rights from the car ports and garages on this site.

Councillor Crystall asked whether there would be fibre broadband to the door and he sought clarification as

to whether the Section 106 NHS funding would be valid in this case. The Principal Planning Officer said that the main access would be adopted and maintained to County Council standards. She said that withdrawal of permitted development rights to secure retention of bungalows was the only reasonable option as including this in a Section 106 agreement would be unfair to future occupiers.

Members were advised that this site was not within the flood plain or within flood zones one or two. The Principal Planning Officer said there would a condition to prevent any change of use in respect of garages and car ports. She stated that the NHS funding in the Section 106 agreement was a valid request and Members were advised that a condition had been applied requiring that details be submitted in respect of fibre broadband to the door.

Councillor Kaye referred to the short term impact of construction traffic and welcomed the fact that some of the properties would have solar panels. He welcomed the bungalows and the affordable housing as key to this application in many ways and concluded by stating that this was a relatively attractive development.

Councillor Beckett said this was probably the best quality small scale development to have come forward in Bishop's Stortford, particularly when compared to Bishop's Stortford North and Bishop's Stortford South. He stated that he felt for the residents of Manor Links with their quiet neighbourhood of bungalows. He referred to the traffic impacts which could not be

underestimated and he asked whether a condition could be applied requiring that construction traffic uses the first entrance onto the site for both developments and utilises the proposed extension to the driving range to go around the existing tree line. He asked whether the developer would be amenable to speed humps to reduce the speed of motorists post development.

Councillor Redfern asked how homes were for social rent and how many would be shared ownership. She referred to paragraph 8.8 on page 60 of the report and expressed concerns that overdevelopment of other strategic sites was being used to justify even more development on this site. She said that having fewer units would have allowed for more space to accommodate a play area.

The Principal Planning Officer said that an equipped play area could not be requested based on the proposed number of units. She said that the green space would serve as a local area of play and a more formal arrangement would need to be fenced and Officers did not feel that this would be appropriate in this location.

Members were advised that further mitigation for the construction of this development would be provided in the form of a construction management plan and a very specific condition would be assessed by Environmental Health Officers and by Hertfordshire Highways in order to secure a very safe access that would not cause harm.

The Principal Planning Officer said that speed humps had not been requested by the County Council and residents often did not like speed impacts due to their impact. She said that 61 units compared to 50 could be considered to be over and above what Officers would consider to be around or in the region of but in planning terms this was acceptable unless there were good policy reasons to refuse as this was an allocated site in the District Plan.

The Service Manager (Development Management) said that the removal of permitted development rights for the bungalows was about as far as the Committee could legitimately go and the bungalows had been specifically redesigned to be at a low level. He said that alterations to include dormers or additional stories would be considered to be out of character in such a uniform line of dwellings.

Councillor Kemp said that he was very pleased with the design and location of the bungalows and he was particularly pleased that two of these bungalows were for affordable rent. He said that he would be interested to know how the density of this development for 61 units compared to other similar developments and he was also interested to know whether the original plan for this development had included so many bungalows.

Councillor Kemp commented on the routing of traffic via the first access off Manor Links and he had noted that the roundabout at the end of this road provides reasonable access for heavy and residential traffic onto Dunmow Road. He commended the developer

for their approach to sustainability and the fabric first approach and the planned use of solar panels.

Councillor Bull welcomed the bungalows and expressed some concerns over the plans for adoption of the new roads. He commented on the security of the golf course and sought some clarity around the link road. The Principal Planning Officer said that there was originally expected to be bungalows on the site adjacent to the bungalows on Manor Links. She said that this was not the densest of developments and it was mid-range in terms of density.

Members were advised that the proposals were clearly of a higher density than the housing on Manor Links and Officers would not expect this development to replicate that density. The Officer said that there was no access proposed through the golf course to the site.

Councillor Fernando shared the concerns of Councillor Ruffles regarding the permitted development rights. He said that it was positive that cabling for electric charging was going into all of the properties. He commented on the likely output and installation levels of solar panels and the likely benefits of this regarding this development. He referred to residents' concerns in respect of the driving range and the risk of golf balls in the new development.

Councillor Crystall expressed some concerns regarding the biodiversity calculations of the developer were regarded as a bit thin by the consultees. He said that one of these figures was just 0.85 positive in terms of a net gain. He asked whether this figure could be

increased to avoid the biodiversity increase becoming a negative outcome. He commented on which authority was responsible should levels of NOx rise above acceptable standards in this area.

Councillor Kemp said he was glad to see Section 106 funding for the NHS and he asked for some clarification as to why this funding was considered to be valid under Section 106 rules. The Principal Planning Officer said that the existing driving range could not be used if this development went ahead and the implications of the new driving range were the subject of a separate application.

Members were advised that the biodiversity assessment proposed an increase of 0.85 percent. The Officer said that there was no set amount in legislation as to the amount of net gain that should be provided, simply that a net gain should be provided. The Service Manager (Development Management) said that the situation as regards emissions and building regulations was separate to the planning process. As regards building regulations approval, the authority could be from any inspector or company approved to clear building regulations at the time the application was approved.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Legal Services Manager confirmed that 61 dwellings fell within the region of about in reference to the District Plan allocation of 50 dwelling for this strategic site. Also at the Chairman's invitation, the Principal Planning Officer referred Members to the summary of late representations in respect of concerns from residents

in terms of how these had been addressed. She said that as regards whether the development was COVID safe, there were no policies on this and any requirements on this could not be imposed on the developer.

The Service Manager (Development Management) said that the government had not brought any new design requirements re making schemes COVID safe. He said that there were precedents for strategic sites in terms of the numbers of units exceeding the allocations in the District Plan. He said density was essentially a matter of design and the planning inspectorate had applied flexibility around those design issues.

Councillor Kemp proposed, and Councillor Stowe seconded, a motion that application 3/20/0245/FUL be granted subject to a legal agreement and the conditions set out at the end of the report and delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control to finalise the Section 106 legal agreement and conditions.

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

RESOLVED -that (A) planning permission be granted subject to a legal agreement and the conditions set out at the end of this report; and

(B) authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to finalise the Section 106 Legal Agreement and conditions.

- 157 3/18/2735/FUL - HYBRID PLANNING APPLICATION COMPRISING: FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR 85 DWELLINGS ALONG WITH A NEW ACCESS ONTO CAMBRIDGE ROAD, PROVISION OF NEW SPINE ROAD, LANDSCAPING, ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING; AND OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR UP TO 99 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPE AND INFRASTRUCTURE WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT ACCESS AT LAND AT CAMBRIDGE ROAD, SAWBRIDGEWORTH
-

The Head of Planning and Building Control recommended that in respect of application 3/18/2735/FUL, planning permission be granted subject to a legal agreement and the conditions detailed in the report now submitted. It was also recommended that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control to finalise the detail of the legal agreement and conditions.

The Principal Planning Officer, on behalf of the Head of Planning and Building Control, referred to the late representations summary list that had been provided. She referred to the response of the Highway Authority to a query she had raised regarding the highways implications of the proposed development. She said that there were no plans to reduce the speed limit of 30 mph. She also referred to the matter of bus stops within the carriageway on the main highway and the issue of a signalised junction.

Members were advised of concerns regarding the sustainability of the development in terms of the lack

of solar panels and the lack of suitable infrastructure proposals. The Officer also referred to the matter of improvements to the A1184 prior to construction and a request that these matters be raised with the developer. Members were advised that all of these matters had been covered in the Committee report.

The Principal Planning Officer said that this was a hybrid application that was part full and part outline for two thirds of the SAWB4 strategic site in the District Plan which was located to the north of Sawbridgeworth. She said that phase one was the full application for eighty five dwellings and the outline application at phase two was for up to ninety nine dwellings to the eastern side of the site.

Members were advised that the phase one full application site had been designed around an L shaped open space which coincided with the existing areas of trees within the site. The Officer said that most of the site was agricultural grazing land which included a small area of trees which would be retained. The application included a spine road that would also run through phase two and the Officer said that application included a variety of house types and sizes.

The Principal Planning Officer said that the proposed development was generally in accordance with the adopted masterplan. She detailed the location of the affordable housing and summarised the proposed building heights of two and two and half storey dwellings and a part 3 storey flatted block situated close to the southern site boundary.

Members were advised that the orange markers on the plan indicated the location of affordable rented units and the blue markers were for the shared ownership units. The Officer said that forty percent of the dwellings in total would be affordable in accordance with policy. She said that the affordable housing was not concentrated in one area and was spread in groups around the site. She advised that these units were intended to be tenure blind.

The Principal Planning Officer summarised the proposed access works. She said that the main access remained in the original position but would be widened and improved. She said that a right turn lane was proposed and as some concerns had been raised regarding the access, Officers had contacted the Highway Authority to clarify a number of issues.

Members were advised that a potential proposal to reduce the speed limit to 30 mph was on the original application drawings. This had been considered and reviewed by the Hertfordshire County Council speed management group meeting prior to them responding to the application. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that this group had concluded that a reduction in the speed limit was not warranted. She also said that traffic modelling had indicated that a signalised junction was not necessary in this location and the road layout would be subject to stage one and stage two road safety audits.

Members were advised that bus stop improvements were proposed as part of the scheme and these were within the carriageway of the main road, which would

have an impact in terms of slowing the traffic down. The Officer said that this was the best option as buses would struggle to re-join the carriageway if they had pulled off the road into a bus stop and this was preferable in terms of minimising delays to passenger transport. She said that the prioritisation of passenger transport over the private car was part of the long term sustainability policy.

The Principal Planning Officer displayed a number of elevation drawings and made a number of points about the design and layout of the proposed development. She said that the full planning application was a good quality application that met adopted policy standards in terms of the design of affordable housing units and the design achieved an improvement over building regulations requirements. She also said that the application would result in a net gain in terms of biodiversity.

The Principal Planning Officer concluded that the phase 2 outline application was for up to 99 dwellings with all matters reserved and there would be a potential phase 3 application coming forward at some point. Mr Kibirige addressed the Committee in support of the application. Councillor Furnace addressed the Committee on behalf of Sawbridgeworth Town Council.

Councillor Beckett said that he took issue with the sustainability of the designs in that he believed that these would not perform as well as expected and would fall below building regulation requirements in future. He said that it was disappointing and not good

enough for a developer already working in East Herts to submit an application with such a weak sustainability agenda.

Councillor Beckett said that motorists could not move along the main road most of the time and he could not understand how the likely traffic impact could be judged to be minimal as a result of the proposed development and he felt that the impact could not pass any kind of test. He said that the lack of a travel plan, which was a legal requirement, was a concern and he felt that this scheme should be deferred until that document had been received.

Councillor Crystall said that 3.5 percent above part L of the building regulations standards was not acceptable given that these homes would prove expensive to heat and would not meet current or future standards. He said that it would be left to residents to bring the units up to standard and he stated that the housing would not be of the high quality standard that should be delivered in East Herts.

Councillor Crystall said that he was concerned over two properties that would have noisy gardens. He stated that a condition should be applied to secure noise panels or trees and bushes. He said that in an air quality management area, boilers were not acceptable and should not be used even though they would produce low levels of NOx. He said that solar panels and air source heat pumps should be used instead of boilers. He concluded that an electric car club should be planned to control emissions and he said that he was really disappointed by this whole site.

Councillor Buckmaster said that she accepted that this site was part of the East Herts District Plan and the principle of development was not in question. She said that she was very concerned regarding this application given that two thirds of an application already equated to 184 dwellings. She expressed her concern that with SAWB2 and SAWB3 having gone over the expected number, the town was now going to have nearer 600 new homes instead of the 500 home allocation stipulated in the East Herts District Plan.

Councillor Buckmaster said that the landscape advice had stated that the site layout was awkward and the tandem parking arrangement was indicative of overdevelopment. She referred to the areas of concern identified by the Landscape Officer. She said that the three storey element of the application was on a higher elevation and would therefore be very overbearing and overpowering.

Councillor Buckmaster said that the forty percent affordable housing and the tenure split was good. She was concerned however over why two bedroom flats were proposed when the local demand was for two bedroom houses for families. She said that the application should be deferred to allow the developer to address a lot of the points of concern that had been raised on this scheme. She also commented on the poor air quality and asked for clarification on what mitigation was planned for this.

The Principal Planning Officer said that there was the framework of a travel plan which had been looked at

by Hertfordshire County Council and Officers there had said this document had set out a suitable travel plan for this stage of the application process. She said that a condition requiring the submission of the full detailed travel plan had been applied and Section 106 provisions would cover improvements to sustainable transport in this area.

Members were advised that, as regards their concerns over building regulations, the policy requirements had been satisfied in that the standard that would be achieved was equal to the required benchmark set out by regulations. The Officer said that the Environmental Health Officer had confirmed that two properties would experience noise levels that were slightly higher than they should be. The Officer had stated that this was acceptable as there was alternative usable open space in the vicinity of this site.

The Principal Planning Officer said that the matter of air quality was covered in the report and the mitigation measures included the provision of monies towards electric vehicle charging points and other measures included as part of this development. The Environmental Health Officer was satisfied with these proposals for phase one and had said that this issue would be looked at again when phase two came forward for development to prevent further harm to the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

Members were advised that the Section 106 monies for leisure provision had to be tied down to specific projects at the nearest leisure facility. The Officer said that if no project had been identified at Leventhorpe

Pool and Gym, the nearest facility for funding would be Grange Paddocks in Bishop's Stortford if a project had been identified there.

The Service Manager (Development Management) said that sustainability was a rapidly moving situation in terms of policy and the policy in the District Plan simply encouraged but did not require sustainability measures. He said that this matter would be addressed through a review of the District Plan.

Councillor Kemp asked the Officers if the developer had given any reason for not achieving a better outcome in terms of the fabric first approach. He asked for some guidance from the Legal Services Manager on the implications of deferring planning permission in this case.

The Principal Planning Officer said that no explanation had been given as to why the applicant had not offered more terms of carbon dioxide emissions. She said the developer was well aware of the Council's aspiration for developers to do better but the application complied with policy and Officers could only apply the available policies.

Members were advised that the LAP did not have to contain any equipment but in this case some static climbing equipment was proposed. The Officer confirmed to Councillor Kemp that Officers had gone back to the NHS to clarify the requirements for the Section 106 legal agreement in terms of where the money would go.

The Legal Services Manager said that deferral was an option for the Committee and the reasons for the deferral must be linked to planning grounds with reasoning for the deferral of planning permission. She said that a deferral carried a risk of an appeal for non-determination if an application was not determined within set time frames or if there had been no extension of time agreement.

At this point (9:43 pm), it was proposed by Councillor Page and seconded by Councillor Bull that the Committee pass a resolution that the meeting should continue until the completion of the agenda. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, this motion was declared CARRIED.

Councillor Redfern expressed concerns regarding the affordable housing being located on the fringes of the development thereby exposing those residents to the worst of the noise and pollution. She expressed concerns that these units had not been pepper potted throughout the development.

Councillor Page expressed a number of concerns regarding site sustainability and policy consistency. He asked whether the traffic assessment dealt only with site access or did it also address issue surrounding local roads. He commented on the lack of commentary on traffic modelling for the A1184 between Harlow and Bishop's Stortford.

Councillor Page asked for some clarification around transport modal shift and the policy consistency of the proposed 217 car parking spaces when the policy

requirement was for 156 spaces. He said that he had seen nothing about self-build or custom build properties as covered by the provisions of the SAWB4 policy.

Councillor Kaye commented on page 116 of the report and covered secured cycle storage facilities being proposed for every dwelling and electric vehicle charging points being proposed in accordance with policy. He asked whether the applicant could say this would not be provided if it was not secured by the conditions detailed in the report submitted.

The Principal Planning Officer said that noise and air quality issues for occupants of the affordable housing were looked at by Environmental Health and Officers were satisfied that the living conditions were acceptable. She confirmed that Hertfordshire Highways had looked at the area as a whole when assessing the impact of this application and highway improvements linked to other recently approved schemes.

The Principal Planning Officer said that there was nothing to prevent an applicant providing more spaces than the 25 percent less than the 208 required by policy. She said that 156 could have been provided if there were good public transport connections and other accessibility benefits. She said that the proposed parking was policy compliant.

Councillor Kemp asked whether an explanation could be given as to why Hertfordshire Highways had not considered the possibility of widening the road to allow for bus stops and avoid the need for other traffic

having to stop or swing out past the stopped buses.

The Service Manager (Development Management) said that Hertfordshire Highways would only adopt roads that had been built to an adoptable standard. The Head of Planning and Building Control said that this was a strategic site in the District Plan and she referred to the comments and concerns expressed by Members. She said Members must be very clear as to any reasons for refusal or deferral.

The Chairman said that Members must determine the application that was in front of them and on the basis of the existing policy framework. The Legal Services Manager confirmed that this was correct and she said that Members must base their decisions on the development plan unless there were other material planning considerations.

Members were reminded that this was a strategic site in the District Plan and Members must give clear and convincing reasons for any refusal of planning permission. The Legal Services Manager said that the implications of refusal could be an appeal and Members must be prepared to give evidence for their decisions at appeal proceedings.

Councillor Stowe proposed, and Councillor Page seconded, a motion that application 3/18/2735/FUL be granted subject to a legal agreement and the conditions set out at the end of the report and delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control to finalise the Section 106 legal agreement and conditions.

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

RESOLVED –that (A) planning permission be granted subject to a legal agreement and the conditions set out at the end of this report; and

(B) authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to finalise the Section 106 Legal Agreement and conditions.

158 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 10.09 pm

| |
|----------------|
| Chairman |
| Date |