

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL
CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD ON
WEDNESDAY 1 DECEMBER 2021, AT 7.00
PM

PRESENT: Councillor B Deering (Chairman)
Councillors D Andrews, T Beckett,
R Buckmaster, B Crystall, S Bull,
R Fernando, I Kemp, S Newton, C Redfern
and T Stowe

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Paul Courtine	- Planning Lawyer
Peter Mannings	- Democratic Services Officer
Emma Mumby	- Planning Officer
Ellen Neumann	- Trainee Planning Assistant
Elizabeth Oswick	- Trainee Planning Assistant
Karen Page	- The Service Manager (Development Management and Enforcement)
Lucy Pateman	- Planning Officer

260 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Page and Ruffles. It was noted that Councillor Bull was

substituting for Councillor Ruffles. It was also noted that Councillor Devonshire had agreed to substitute for Councillor Page, but was unable to do so as he was unwell.

261 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Chairman's Announcements.

262 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

263 MINUTES - 6 OCTOBER 2021

Councillor Buckmaster proposed and Councillor Redfern seconded, a motion that the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2021 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

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

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2021, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

264 3/21/2577/HH - TWO STOREY AND FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION. DETACHED GARAGE AND GAMES ROOM. RELOCATION OF DOOR FROM SIDE TO FRONT ELEVATION. REMOVAL OF CHIMNEY AND FIREPLACE AT BROOK COTTAGE, CHIPPING, BUNTINGFORD, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG9 0PG

The Head of Planning and Building Control recommended that in respect of application 3/21/2577/HH, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed at the end of the report.

The Planning Officer, on behalf of the Head of Planning and Building Control, gave a description of the site in Chipping and advised that this was accessible via a lane off the A10. She said that to the north and south of the site there were a number of residential properties and to the west was the Countryman Pub and there were open fields to the east.

Members were advised that the site was located in the rural area beyond the green belt and fell inside the Buntingford Community Neighbourhood Plan Area and also fell inside an area of archaeological significance.

The Planning Officer said that the River Rib ran adjacent to the site and parts of the site were located within flood zones two and three. She detailed the planning history of the site and reminded Members of the provisions of policy GBR2. Members were shown the proposed and existing elevations drawings and the Planning Officer pointed out the proposed developments covered by the application.

The Planning Officer said that the proposed gable ends that were adjacent to an existing gable end would be well screened by existing boundary treatment to the rear of the site and there would therefore be limited harm on the character and appearance of the dwelling and rural area.

Members were advised that the external materials were render and slate roof tiles to match the existing dwelling. The Planning Officer advised that the proposed one and a half storey garage would have a pitched roof and would be adjacent to the proposed extension. She said that the garage would incorporate a ground floor parking space with a games room above and there would be a dormer window on the front and back which would be clad in black weather boarding in contrast to the render on the main dwelling.

Members were advised that the proposed building was not considered to be of an inappropriate size or scale in relation to its proposed use and Officers considered that it would sit comfortably within the site.

The Planning Officer said that the proposals included the removal of an existing chimney stack that was presently located centrally on the existing roof. It was considered that this would have limited harm on the appearance of the dwelling and overall Officers were satisfied that the proposals were of an appropriate size, scale and design to comply with policy GBR2 as well as the relevant design policies of the District Plan.

The Planning Officer said that in terms of neighbour amenity impact, Members should note that the surrounding properties were a significant distance from Brook Cottage and there would be no impact in terms of loss of light, outlook, privacy or any overbearing impact.

Members were advised that in terms of parking the proposed development would increase the number of

bedrooms from three to four and parking standards required that there should be three off street parking spaces. The Planning Officer said that the existing driveway and proposed garage would accommodate this level of provision and this was compliant with District Plan Policy and the Buntingford Community Neighbourhood Plan.

The Planning Officer said that as part of the proposed extension fell within flood zone two, a flood risk assessment had been submitted in line with the standing advice of the Environment Agency. She said that the property would not be at risk from flooding as the internal floor levels would be sufficiently above the flood level.

Members were advised that overall it was considered that the proposals were of an appropriate size, scale and design and materials to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the rural area.

The Planning Officer concluded that there would be no adverse impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties. She said that there would be adequate levels of parking provision and it had been demonstrated that flood risks can be managed effectively.

The Chairman asked if Officers had applied the condition requested by Buckland and Chipping Parish in respect of the detached garage being not converted to residential accommodation. The Planning Officer confirmed that an informative had been applied as this was a householder application and there had been no

suggestion that it would be occupied independently of the main dwelling.

Councillor Kemp commented on this being a good application that had been carefully considered. He drew attention to a typographical error in the informative at the end of the report. He said that it carried weight that there had been no objections from the relevant bodies or the neighbours.

Councillor Crystall said that the proposed extension worked quite nicely and would look good from the front elevation. He said that he understood the reasons for removing the chimney but it would be sad to lose it as the chimney as it told a story about the house when it was there.

Councillor Bull referred to the application as being for a modest development and he said that there would be no overlooking and there had no objections from neighbours. He said that this was a nice development and he commented on the impact on deer in the area.

Councillor Andrews proposed and Councillor Beckett seconded, a motion that application 3/21/2577/HH be granted planning permission subject to the conditions detailed at the end of the report. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that in respect of application 3/21/2577/HH, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed at the end of the report.

265 A) 3/21/1916/FUL AND B) 3/21/1917/LBC - SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND GLAZED INFILL EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION AT COURTYARD ARTS CENTRE, PORT VALE, HERTFORD, SG14 3AA

The Head of Planning and Building Control recommended that in respect of application 3/21/1916/FUL and 3/21/1917/LBC, planning permission and listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions detailed at the end of the report.

The Planning Officer, on behalf of the Head of Planning and Building Control, drew the attention of the Committee to the additional representations summary that had been circulated. She said that three additional matters were covered in the summary and the first of these was the existing parking lease arrangements.

Members were advised that under the terms of the previously approved planning application, it was agreed that four car parking permits would be made available to enable staff to park in the adjacent Port Vale Car Park.

The Planning Officer said that the Council's Parking Team had since confirmed that no permits would be made available. She said that the parking lease arrangements were not a material planning consideration and the number of car parking spaces available was a separate issue to the contractual arrangement regarding parking permits.

Members were advised that the second matter related to the inclusion of a bird and bat box condition to address the comments raised by the Bengoe Neighbourhood Area Plan Group in respect of enhancing local biodiversity.

The Planning Officer advised that the third matter was the inclusion of a condition to secure details of how the design and construction of the development would minimise overheating in the summer and reduce the need for heating in the winter and also to reduce energy and water demand.

The Planning Officer detailed the proposed development and said that the property was a part two storey and part single storey building established historically as the curtilage listed stable building for the adjacent grade two listed Vale House located to the east of the site.

Members were advised that the site was located in the Hertford Conservation Area and this was an area of archaeological significance and the site was located in flood zone two. The building was identified as a community facility within the Bengoe Neighbourhood Area Plan.

The Planning Officer said that as the building was curtilage listed, full planning permission and listed building consent applications were required for this development. She detailed the planning history of the site and said that the applications were being considered by Members as this was a Council owned building to which an objection had been made which

was material to the proposed development.

Members were advised that the key issues for Members to consider relate to the principle of the development, community benefit, design and impact on heritage assets, impact on mature trees and parking provision, flood risk, impact of residential amenity, ecology and sustainability.

The Planning Officer said that both applications were being recommended for approval subject to conditions. She said that the principle of the development was considered to be acceptable and the scheme would improve and enhance the existing community use of the building. Members were advised that this positive aspect of the proposals should be given significant weight.

The Planning Officer said that in terms of the design and the impact on heritage assets, Members should be aware that the Conservation Officer had raised an objection as detailed in the report. She reminded Members that the scheme was the same as the development that had been approved under the 2018 application.

Members were advised that the harm identified in relation to the slate roof of the proposed infill extension was considered to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals. The Planning Officer said that the insertion of roof lights without glazing bars would not result in harm to the curtilage listed building given the variety of existing roof lights on the existing property.

The Committee was advised that the proposed materials of construction would match those of the existing building and a condition was recommended regarding samples of materials prior to the commencement of the development. The Planning Officer said that the impact on mature trees was considered to be acceptable subject to a condition that would ensure that construction works were carried out in line with the arboricultural impact assessment.

Members were advised that the proposals would result in the loss of seven public car parking spaces by way of the construction of the single storey rear extension within the Port Vale car park. The Council's Assets and Estate Manager had confirmed that if planning permission was granted, the five car parking spaces currently allocated for the Courtyard Arts Centre employees in the Port Vale Car Park would be made available for general public use. Members were advised that there would be net loss of two public car parking spaces in the Port Vale Car Park leaving 20 spaces overall.

The Planning Officer said that it should be recognised that the increase in floor area at the site would warrant the provision of four additional onsite car parking spaces for visitors and employees yet no parking provision had been proposed within the application. She said that the sustainable location of the site close to the town centre with nearby public car parking and access to sustainable transport links meant that there would be no significant detrimental impact on parking.

Members were advised that the community benefit of the scheme was considered to outweigh the under provision of car parking. The Planning Officer said that the request for cycle parking from the Bengo Neighbourhood Area Plan Group had been acknowledged. Members were advised that the existing site had no cycle parking and there was no provision within the immediate vicinity.

The Committee was advised that the proposed increase in floor space did not warrant the provision of any further cycle parking and the site was in a sustainable location. The Planning Officer said that the boundary of the site was tight to the building which made the provision of onsite cycle parking difficult. She said that this was in line with the Council's adopted vehicle parking standards supplementary planning document and policy TRA3 of the East Herts District Plan.

Members were advised that in terms of flood risk, the proposals were in accordance with the Environment Agency's standing advice for minor developments. The Planning Officer said that it was recommended that details were required by condition to secure details in respect of surface water drainage.

The Committee was advised that there would be no impact in respect of residential amenity given the size, scale and siting of the proposed development. The Planning Officer said that the hours of operation of the use of the building would remain the same as the existing opening hours.

The Planning Officer said that whilst the application site was not within a protected wildlife area, it was recognised that there was an opportunity to enhance local biodiversity by installing bat or bird boxes and details of this were recommended to be secured by a condition. She said that on balance it was considered that the identified harm in respect of design, impact on heritage assets and loss of parking would be outweighed by the benefits in terms of the provision of additional floor space in a community facility.

Councillor Fernando welcomed the change from glazed to slate roofing and said that he had noted whilst there was no existing or proposed cycle storage, this was not in breach of the East Herts District Plan.. Councillor Cystall said that the community benefit was significant. He referred to the former stables and the paved grey blocks in place in the courtyard. He said that he would plea that these were kept as it would be sad to lose that linkage with the stable usage on a listed building.

Councillor Newton said that she had watched this area grow over the years and she did not consider that his application would make a lot of difference. She referred to the comments of the Landscape Officer regarding the bin store on a Lime Tree and a possible adverse arboricultural impact.

Councillor Newton asked for clarification in terms of the impact on the Lime Tree of the bin. She said that the Landscape Officer had suggested the relocation or omission of the bin store and it also said in the report that this element of the development had been removed from the proposals.

The Planning Officer said that the bin store was included in the original plans. She confirmed that the bin store was removed from the plans following the comments of the Landscape Officer so this was no longer an issue. Members were advised that the existing site had bin storage located internally and it was assumed that this would also be the case with the new proposals.

Councillor Beckett said that considering the increased footprint of the building, he wondered whether the applicant had indicated whether there might be a need to replace the current heating system within the building. He commented on the great opportunity for increasing energy efficiency and improving the sustainability of the site. The Planning Officer said that no details had been provided in that respect and a condition had been recommended to cover that aspect of the proposal.

Councillor Crystall proposed and Councillor Fernando seconded, a motion that applications 3/21/1916/FUL and 3/21/1917 be granted planning permission and listed building consent, subject to the conditions detailed at the end of the report and subject to the additional conditions detailed in the additional representations summary. After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that in respect of applications 3/21/1916/FUL and 3/21/1917/LBC, planning permission and listed building consent be

granted subject to the conditions detailed at the end of the report and subject to the additional conditions detailed in the additional representations summary.

266 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; and
- (D) Planning Statistics.

267 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

The meeting closed at 7.34 pm

Chairman
Date