

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

Date: Tuesday, 9 August 2022

Time: 6.30pm

Place: Council Chamber

Present: Councillors: Michael Downing (Chair), Adrian Brown (Vice Chair),
Maureen McKay, Sandra Barr, Teresa Callaghan, Matt Creasey,
Chris Howells, Graham Lawrence CC, Mrs Joan Lloyd, Adam Mitchell
CC, Claire Parris, Graham Snell and Anne Wells

Start / End Start Time: 6.30pm
Time: End Time: 10.30pm

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Julie Ashley-Wren.

Councillor Andy McGuinness was in attendance as a substitute.

Councillor Chris Howells declared that he would be speaking in relation to Items 5 and 6 on the Agenda as a ward Councillor representing his constituents and as such would take no part in the subsequent debate and would not vote on the items.

At this juncture, the Development Manager gave an update to the Committee in relation to the development at Franklins Park and in particular the current situation regarding the acoustic fence.

Members were advised that in response to concerns raised by residents, an independent noise consultant had been requested to provide a report on the installation of the fence and the resultant reflective noise impact to residents, particularly in the Symonds Green area. A further report to Members would be given on any necessary action once the consultant's report had been received.

2 MINUTES - 14 JULY 2022

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning and Development Committee held on 14 July 2022 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3 ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2020-21

The Committee received a presentation from the Planning Policy Manager and Principal Planning Officer regarding the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2020 – 21.

Members were advised that the AMR reported on the following:

- Local Context and Contextual Indicators – indicators that set the scene/paint the picture of the district being planned for;
- Progress of the Development Plan against the Local Development Scheme (LDS); Duty to Co-operate;
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL); and
- Growth/changes in the district in the monitoring year.

Officers reported that the programme of reporting was slightly behind schedule due to the Covid-19 pandemic and staffing issues within the Team but it was hoped that the 2021/22 AMR would be published by December 2022. Members were also advised that early work had begun on the Local Plan Review.

It was **RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

4 **19/00062/OPM - LAND AT MAXWELL ROAD**

The Committee considered a report in respect of application 19/00062/OPM seeking permission for an outline application (with all matters reserved except access) for the demolition of existing buildings and replacement with buildings to accommodate new office and residential floorspace (Class E and Class C3), with associated landscaping, car parking and ancillary works on land at Maxwell Road, Stevenage.

The Assistant Director of Planning and Regulation advised the Committee that the application had previously received planning permission. However this permission had been quashed in May 2020 by the High Court via a Quashing Order on the grounds of sunlight and daylight effects of the development on the Grade II Listed Broomin Green Farmhouse, following a judicial review of the permission.

The Development Manager gave a presentation in respect of the application, including details about the site, context, and the proposed development which had been brought to the Committee for decision.

The Committee was advised that the main issues for consideration of the application was its acceptability in land use policy terms, affordable housing and planning obligations, visual impact of the development, impact of the development on the setting of the listed building and the demolition of the non-designated heritage asset, impact on archaeology, impact upon neighbouring amenities, impact upon future amenities of residents, parking provision, highway implications, development and flood risk, impact on the environment, trees and landscaping and ecology.

The Chair then invited John Somers, an objector and resident of Broomin Green Farmhouse, to address the Committee. Mr Somers objections included:

- The proposed office block behind the farmhouse would take away sunlight and daylight to the main living space;
- The service road for the new office block was within a few metres of the main living room and would bring a considerable amount of noise;
- The amount of vehicles that would be using Maxwell Road was not safe for such a small road;

- The application was an overdevelopment of the site and not in keeping with its current use and have an adverse effect on the local facilities and highway network.

Zoe Coulson, an objector to the application was then invited to address the Committee. Ms Coulson's objections related to the need for family houses and not more flats; noise pollution in the area; and the unacceptable effects on Broomin Green Farmhouse and its occupiers.

Officers reported that an independent Noise Report had been commissioned by Mr and Lady Somers which had been circulated to Members for their consideration.

The Chair thanked Mr Somers and Ms Coulson for their presentations. He then invited Mr Sensecall, Carter Jonas, on behalf of the applicant to address the Committee.

Mr Sensecall advised that the applicants had worked closely with Stevenage Borough Council to ensure the application had been improved since the original application and would be acceptable in planning terms with a mixture of residential and commercial units being brought forward for the scheme. He advised that the site was now no longer fit for purpose and the development and subsequent CIL payments would be to the Town's advantage.

The Chair then thanked all three speakers for their contributions and asked the Development Manger to continue with his report to the Committee.

The Development Manager advised that the proposed commercial building would broadly align with the requirements of the local plan if it was used for light industrial or research and development. However, the development would fail to accord with the Plan as the residential aspect would be located on designated employment land and a subsequent loss of employment potential.

In terms of heritage impact, the Development Manager explained to the Committee that the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 incorporated several statutory duties for decision makers, those which were applicable to the proposed development were:

S.66(1) In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The Development Manager then advised Members about relevant case, he advised that case law (South Lakeland, 1992) determined that 'preserve' meant do no harm. However, if harm was identified, the NPPF provided a means of weighing either 'substantial harm' or 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset against the public benefits of the proposal. In doing so, case law has emphasised the need to give 'considerable importance and weigh' to preserving listed buildings and conservation areas (Barnwell Manor, Case No. C1/2013/0843).

However, the presumption 'to preserve' is not irrebuttable and 'can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so' (Forge Fields – Case numbers CO/735/2013; CO/16932/2013) and a decision maker that has followed the process set out in the NPPF, in respect to weighing the harm and benefits, can reasonably be expected to have complied with the 'statutory duties' of the 1990 Act (Mordue, Case No. C1/2015/1067).

In determining applications, the Development Manager explained to the Committee that the NPPF requires LPAs to take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhance the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses, consistent with their conservation, and the positive contribution of heritage assets can make to sustainable communicates.

When considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, Broomin Green Farm, the Development Manager emphasises that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss of less than substantial harm to its significance.

The Development Manager also explained that any harm to a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justifications in accordance with the NPPF, proposals that cause less than substantial harm the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

In undertaking that weighing exercise, the Development Manager advised the Committee that 'considerable importance and weight' must first be given to the requirement to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building, including their setting... (i.e. their significance). In determining the application, it must be noted that 'less than substantial harm' is not less than substantial planning consideration.

Turning to the impact of Broomin Green Farm which is Grade II listed, the Development Manager advised that consideration must be given to preserving the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building, including its setting.

The Development Manager explained to the Committee that whilst outside the application site, Broomin Green Farm was bordered on three sides by the application site. On the western border you have FIRA, on the northern border was Serviceline and on the eastern border was the veterinary hospital. The southern border abuts the cycle track which runs parallel with Fairlands Way.

The Development Manager went on to stipulate that Broomin Green Farmhouse was a 17th Century Grade II listed building. In terms of views of the building, these were limited from outside the curtilage of the farmhouse, but, it was appreciated that there were some key elements of the building's setting which contributed to its immediate setting. This includes the southern garden which was the last remaining element of greenspace belonging to the rural landscape and the mature trees and planting forming the buildings immediate surroundings.

The Development Manager then explained to Members that the development would not entail any direct physical alteration to the listed building or its immediate plot. In addition, it was recognised by both officers and the Heritage Advisor that the heritage asset i.e. Broomin Green Farm, in terms of its architectural and historic significance would remain unchanged. Therefore, in terms of the requirement to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building, this would be unaffected by the proposed development.

With regards to setting, the Development Manager emphasised that the proposed development would have no impact on the immediate setting of the listed building i.e. the southern garden which was the last remaining element of greenspace which belonged to the farmhouses' rural landscape. In addition, the proposal did not seek to remove any trees which formed a key part of its border. However, it was fully appreciated by officers that the proposed development would not preserve the wider setting of the listed building which had been emphasised by the Council's Heritage Advisor, that the overall scale, massing and form of the development would have an adverse impact upon its setting compared to the existing.

The Development Manager advised that the Committee should consider the fact that the historic setting of Broomin Green Farm had significantly changed from its traditional rural landscape. As set out in the committee report, over the years, since the property was listed in 1948, its setting had been gradually compromised by industrial, commercial and warehouse buildings which had been constructed detracting from the significance of the listed building. Furthermore, the cycle lane and Fairlands Way, were at a higher level, and in some respects eroded the significance of the setting of the listed building. Consequently, the traditional rural landscape of the listed farmhouse has been eroded by 20th urbanisation of land outside the curtilage of the listed farmhouse. Therefore, the Committee should consider the immediate setting of the listed building as being urbanised and industrial in nature.

The Development Manager explained to the Committee that due to the overall size, scale and massing of the proposal, even though slightly reduced, it was considered to have an adverse impact upon the setting of the farmhouse, compared to its existing setting which was not being preserved, would cause, and as set out by the heritage advisor and as agreed by officers, less than substantial harm, being at the lower end, due to the setting of the farmhouse having changed since the mid-20th century.

The Development Manager went on to explain that, and advised by the Council's Heritage advice, when reaching a decision on the application, the Committee should balance the less than substantial harm against the public benefits of the proposal. In this regard, it was the Officer's professional opinion, that the overall public benefits of this development would outweigh the harm caused. However, it was ultimately up to the Committee to determine, based on the evidence, whether or not they considered these benefits did outweigh the harm caused.

The Development Manager then went on to discuss the non-designated heritage asset, which was defined as being a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meeting considerations in

planning decisions, because of its heritage interest.

The Council currently did not currently have an adopted Local List for local heritage assets. However, officers did consider the FIRA building to be a non-designated heritage asset as it was a building of architectural merit. Therefore, it was agreed by Officers that the FIRA building was of significance and there would be harm following the loss of this non-designated heritage asset. In this regard, and established by case law, the Council has to treat it as such in its determination.

Turning to development itself, the Development Manager advised that the proposal would have a direct impact as it would result in the complete loss of the FIRA building which would therefore, and as clearly set out in the Committee Report, would result in substantial harm being caused to the significance of the building in this instance. However, the Committee was advised to consider the significance of the building in question, which, as established by DCMS in their decision letter relating to the request to have the building listed, has been compromised by the unsympathetic extensions and alterations which had been undertaken over the years. Consequently, the significance of the building has been lessened due to the unsympathetic extensions and alterations which have occurred to the building. Furthermore, and on the point about “public benefits”, this had been considered by officers in detail and it was officers professional opinion, that the overall planning and public benefits the scheme outweighed the level of harm caused by the loss of the non-designated heritage asset.

However, and as explained by the Development Manager, this would be subject, and in accordance with the NPPF and as advised by the Council’s Heritage advisor, to record and advance understanding of the significance of the building prior to its demolition. This requirement would be secured by way of condition. Notwithstanding, as mentioned above, it was ultimately the decision of this Committee to determine whether or not the benefits of this development outweighed the loss of the non-designated heritage asset known as the FIRA building.

With regards to the matter around tall buildings, the Development Manager explained to the Committee that officers did not consider the application to be a tall building in context with the wider area of Gunnels Wood Road. In addition, the Council had no specific policies or guidelines on what defines a tall building nor does the NPPF. Officers had also given due regard Historic England Note 4 Tall Buildings (2022) which helped to define what a tall building could be, but, this did not change officers professional opinion in that the scheme did not comprise tall buildings and that there was proportionate and sufficient information for the Council as Local Planning Authority to make a robust and fully justifiable assessment as to the potential impact the development would have on Broomin Green Farm.

It was noted that with regards to sunlight and daylight, the Development Manager was in agreement with the objectors in that there were transgressions i.e. reductions beyond guidelines in terms of the relevant BRE assessments which have been undertaken, specifically in relation to the impact the development will have on the sunlight and daylight which was received in the kitchen, a room used for multi-functional purposes by the owners. As such, and as confirmed by officers, it was acknowledged that there is a conflict with Policy GD1 criterion e of the adopted Local Plan.

The Development Manager advised the Committee that the applicant had submitted a Radiance Assessment which was a more sophisticated way of assessing the development's impact in relation to sunlight and daylight. The Radiance Assessment, as advised by the Council's Sunlight and Daylight Consultant, that the assessment undertaken provided an accurate representation of the light levels within Broomin Green Farm. The assessment indicated that the existing condition of the room in question, was well below the recommended minimum. Thus, supplementary lighting would be required as very little light penetrated beyond the room closest to the window. This was mainly due to the architectural design and layout of the Farmhouse which had an effect in relation to the amount of light which reached this specific window.

The Development Manager set out to the committee that whilst there was a policy conflict, based on the results of the radiance survey, it was not felt by officers there would be sufficient grounds for refusal, especially based on the overall benefits the development will bring which would outweigh the harm.

Furthermore, the Development Manager explained that it was important to consider that any form of development which meets the overall policy aspirations of the Local Plan, including the delivery of a landmark building, would have an impact on the room in question as it would be sensitive in any changes to the built environment, especially given the height of the FIRA building

In regards to noise, the Development Manager advised the Committee that it was noted that in the letter issued by the solicitors acting on behalf of Broomin Green Farm and their consultant, that they were not in agreement with Environmental Health Departments comments as they had not undertaken an assessment in relation the four new parking areas associated with the proposal, noise from vehicles using the access road to the offices and noise from the proposed servicing area associated with the proposed offices. In addition, they contended that there will be a need for screening to mitigate the noise and as no details have provided, an assessment has not been undertaken in relation to this screen which could cause harm to the sunlight and daylight which is received by Broomin Green Farm.

The Development Manager went on to explain that he had discussed these concerns with Environmental Health and their appointed consultant, but that Environmental Health confirmed their previous comments and consider that the conditions proposed (as detailed in the addendum) would be able to mitigate any issues around noise. Furthermore, none of the suggested outline a requirement for a screen to be provided in order to mitigate any noise generated by the development proposal.

The Development Manager advised the Committee that in accordance with advice from the Environmental Health and Consultant have officers were satisfied there are significant flaws with the points made by Broomin Green Farms Noise Consultant. The Development Manager also explained that their noise consultant provided no analysis of the permitted industrial and commercial uses nearby. In addition, the Development Manager also explained that their potential impact compared to that of the proposed has not been considered. The Development Manager concluded that

comparison with a vacant site rather than what is permitted was misleading.

In regards to security, the Development Manager explained that no evidence had been provided to demonstrate that the development would result in additional anti-social behaviour. The Development Manager also advised the committee that he considered the development would improve the situation as there would be more active frontages overlooking footpaths, including the proposed footpath in terms of window positioning and natural surveillance.

The Development Manager also set out to the Committee that the Appeal Decision which was recently issued by the Planning Inspectorate for Land West of Lytton Way referred to the development delivering 576 residential units (mix of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments), in doing so, would support the Government's aim expressed at paragraph 60 of the Framework to significantly boost the supply of housing. Policy SP7 of the Local Plan referred to the need to deliver 7,600 homes over the Plan Period and there was delay in bringing forward a number of strategic sites. In addition, and as stated by the inspector, there had been a past under-delivery. Therefore, the inspector taking into local and national circumstances, gave substantial weight.

The Development Manager explained to the Committee that as this decision was very recent, it was material in the determination of this application in that, there was an overriding need to deliver more housing. With regards to overall concerns being raised about the number of flatted developments which were coming forward, the Development Manager advised the Committee that it was evident, and as was referenced in the Inspector's Decision Letter, that such developments were generally in keeping with the Council's regeneration aspirations for the town.

With respect to the impact of the pandemic on offices, the Development Manager advised that currently there was insufficient evidence at this time to fully understand the impact this has had on office demand. However, there was some evidence the market is changing with co-space working areas. He also advised that officers were aware of a growing market in Stevenage for Research and Development, especially in bio-pharmaceuticals and life sciences.

The Development Manager explained that there were no highway related issues with the proposal, there would be sufficient off-street parking in line with the Council's standards, there were no issues with regards to archaeology, trees or biodiversity net gain. He also mentioned there were no issues with regards to contamination and environmental impact of the development. All related matters would be dealt with by appropriate conditions.

In relation to the residential aspect, the Committee noted that it would provide 80 residential units including 20 affordable housing units and support the Government's aim to increase housing supply over the Local Plan period. The economic benefits of the residential aspect of the site in terms of jobs created from its construction should also be given significant weight.

The Development Manager advised that the development would enhance pedestrian and cycle connectivity, also making the bus stop more accessible. The site was in a

sustainable location close to bus and rail stations and the town centre. The scheme would also accommodate an appropriate level of private amenity provision, parking (including disabled) and cycle parking.

The Development Manager advised that subject to conditions and appropriate mitigation measures and the securing of S106 obligations he would recommend the granting of planning permission in this instance.

Members were then invited to speak on the application. Following a full debate, the following points and concerns were raised by them:

- The presence of an improved location for the bus stop did not guarantee an improved bus service. The footpaths within the scheme did not actually lead to the bus stop;
- The proposal was an over development of the site;
- The proximity of residential blocks would cause direct overlooking of habitable rooms;
- High levels of traffic on Maxwell Road would be generated with only one way in and out of the road;
- The development had insufficient off-street parking;
- The development would result in the loss of the FIRA building, a local heritage asset;
- There was no amenity space for the residential units. It was felt that balconies and roof top gardens were not genuine amenity spaces;
- Family homes were needed rather than small flats;
- The development would be car dependent, there was a lack of appropriate parking provision and cars would be displaced onto nearby residential roads;
- There was insufficient infrastructure and amenities in proximity to the site;
- Preservation of the Town's heritage was an important aspect.

Following further debate, it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1) The outline plans for the residential and commercial development would comprise of insufficient off-street parking, combined with restrictions on Maxwell Road, would likely result in on-street parking along Fairview Road where there are currently no restrictions. This will likely result in a situation which would be prejudicial to the safety and operation of Fairview Road. The development proposal is therefore, contrary to Policies SP6 and IT5 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (adopted 2019), the Council's Parking Provision and Sustainable Transport SPD (2020), the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and National Planning Practice Guidance;
- 2) The outline plans for the residential and commercial development, due to its siting, scale, massing and being up to seven stories in height, would result in an unacceptable loss of sunlight to the kitchen / multi-functional space of Broomin Green Farm to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of this property. Therefore, the proposed development would fail to comply with Policy GD1 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (adopted

2019), the Council's Design Guide SPD (2009), the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and National Planning Practice Guidance;

- 3) Outline plans to redevelop the site with a mix of commercial floorspace of up to 11,059 sq.m and up to 80 flats would result in overdevelopment of the site which would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of Maxwell Road and the visual amenities of the wider area. The development is therefore, contrary to Policies SP8 and GD1 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (adopted 2019), the Council's Design Guide SPD (2009), the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and National Planning Practice Guidance;
- 4) Outline plans for the residential development would include an insufficient provision of children's play space and ground floor amenity space which cannot be adequately provided due to overdevelopment of the site. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to Policies SP7, SP8 and GD1 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (adopted 2019), the Council's Design Guide SPD (2009), the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and National Planning Practice Guidance;
- 5) The outline plans for the residential development would result in an unacceptable loss of designated employment land as designated by Policy EC2a of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (adopted 2019) and that there is currently an undersupply of employment land as identified in the adopted Local Plan. Therefore, the proposal would fail to accord with Policies SP3 and EC4 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (adopted 2019), the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and National Planning Practice Guidance;
- 6) The outline plans for the commercial and residential development due to the proposed buildings in terms of their siting, design, scale, bulk and massing with a height of up to 7 stories located on three sides of the boundary of Broomin Green Farm which is a Grade II listed building, would result in harm which would be 'less than substantial' to the setting of Broomin Green Farm and the harm caused would not be outweighed by the benefits of the proposed development. The development is therefore, contrary to Policy SP13 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2031, the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and National Planning Practice Guidance;
- 7) There is insufficient infrastructure and amenities in proximity to the development site, including GP surgeries and local play spaces, which can be utilised by future occupiers of the residential development. Therefore, the development is not considered to be a sustainable form of development and the developments impact on infrastructure cannot be appropriately mitigated against. Consequently, the proposed development is contrary to Policies SP1, SP2, SP5, SP7, SP8, HO5 and GD1 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (adopted 2019), the Council's Design Guide SPD (2009), the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and National Planning Practice Guide.

5 **22/00625/PATELE - BURGHLEY CLOSE**

The Committee considered an application for a proposed 5G telecoms installation: 15m street pole and 3 additional ancillary equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works.

The application was before the Committee for determination as it had been called in by Roebuck Councillor Chris Howells.

The Senior Planning Officer gave an introduction to the Committee. She advised that the determining issues related to the siting and appearance of the application in particular the design, form, shape and dimensions and also whether there were more suitable sites for the proposed works.

The Chair invited Ms Emma Slattery, an objector, to address the Committee. Ms Slattery's objections related to the adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area, the proximity to a residential dwelling and whether there was a need for 5G in the area when the existing broadband was adequate.

The Chair then invited Councillor Howells to address the Committee. Cllr Howell's concerns related to the reduction in visibility between vehicles and pedestrians, the inappropriateness of the proximity to residential properties and the amount of concerns and complaints he had received from local residents regarding the proposal. Cllr Howells then confirmed that as a member of the Planning and Development Committee he would take no part in the deliberations and would not be voting on the application.

The Chair thanked both speakers for their contributions.

In response to the objections received, the Senior Planning Officer advised that it was not considered that there would be an impact on pedestrian safety due to the distances from the footpaths and the road junction.

In relation to current 5G coverage, it was advised that the siting of masts was not just for the benefit of immediate local residents but a network of masts in the town would improve access to services in the wider area.

In terms of the proximity to residential properties, due to the slim profile of the mast and its distance from the front elevations of nearby properties it was considered that it would not unacceptably harm the outlook of the occupiers of these properties.

It was considered that the justification of the need for the mast and the continued provision of coverage for mobile users outweighed any harm identified in this instance. Officers informed the Committee that the expectation from Central Government was for Local Planning Authorities to respond positively to proposals for telecommunications development and not question the need for equipment in principle, if an operator provided justification for the requirement of an installation, the LPA had no choice but to agree to some form of installation

Members also expressed concern regarding the impact on the site lines at the junction with Hertford Road. Members noted that other sites had been considered in the vicinity but dismissed by the operator as unsuitable due to narrow footpaths, proximity to railway lines and unadopted land.

Following further discussion, it was **RESOLVED** that prior approval be required and given.

6 **22/00635/PATELE - LAND ADJACENT TO VILLAGE CARS, BROADWATER CRESCENT**

The Committee considered an application for the installation of a new 15m high telecommunications monopole and 3no. ground-based equipment cabinets and ancillary development thereto.

The Committee considered an application for a proposed 5G telecoms installation: 15m street pole and 3 additional ancillary equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works.

The application was before the Committee for determination as it had been called in by Roebuck Councillor Chris Howells. Cllr Howells took no part in the deliberations on this item and did not vote on the matter.

The Senior Planning Officer gave an introduction to the Committee. She advised that the determining issues related to the siting and appearance of the application in particular the design, form, shape and dimensions and also whether there were more suitable sites for the proposed works.

It was considered by Officers that the installation and ancillary works would not have an unduly harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area and therefore considered acceptable in terms of siting and appearance. The justification of the need for the mast outweighed the harm identified in this instance.

It was **RESOLVED** that prior approval be Required and Given.

7 **INFORMATION REPORT - DELEGATED DECISIONS**

It was **RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

8 **INFORMATION REPORT - APPEALS/CALLED IN APPLICATIONS**

The Development Manager reported on the recent Appeal Decision from the Planning Inspectorate received in relation to land to the West of Lytton Way, Stevenage (Icon Building).

It was **RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

9 **URGENT PART I BUSINESS**

None.

10 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Not required.

11 **URGENT PART II BUSINESS**

None.

CHAIR