

# Public Document Pack



## PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

2 December 2025

### SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

#### PART 1

##### 3. **25/00400/FPM - MAXWELL ROAD, STEVENAGE, SG1 2EW**

To consider the demolition of existing buildings and erection of Class E discount food store with associated car parking, landscaping, engineering and drainage works.

3 - 6

Supplementary Agenda Published 28/11/25

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3

## Planning Committee

### Supplemental Agenda

<b>Meeting date</b>	2 December 2025
<b>Officer</b>	Thomas Frankland
<b>Agenda Item</b>	Maxwell Road, Stevenage SG1 2EW
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of Class E discount food store with associated car parking, landscaping, engineering and drainage works.
<b>Reference</b>	25/00400/FPM
<b>ADDENDUM INFORMATION</b>	

#### 1. REPRESENTATIONS

- 1.1. Since the publication of the main report, a further objection has been received from Cycle UK Stevenage. A copy of the objection is included as appendix 1 to this addendum.

#### 2. CONSULTATIONS

##### 2.1. SBC Arboriculture Officer

- 2.1.1. Following publication of the main report, further consultations have taken place with the council's arboriculture officer.

- 2.1.2. They have confirmed that the proposed building will not be impacted by the existing, publicly owned trees.

- 2.1.3. However, they consider that replacement planting should be provided at a rate of three new trees for every tree felled as part of the proposal. The current proposal, which is for replacement planting at a rate of approximately 1:1, is not appropriate considering that the existing mature trees would be replaced by saplings without any guarantee of their survival beyond five years.

- 2.1.4. They have explained that an average mature tree would provide canopy cover of 50m<sup>2</sup> to 100m<sup>2</sup> (some even over 200m<sup>2</sup>). In contrast, a newly-planted standard tree, provided that it is well maintained and survives after five years, would have a canopy of less than 1m<sup>2</sup>. In that context, even a replacement ratio of 50:1 wouldn't be enough to compensate the loss of mature trees. In broad terms, the current proposal would result in the loss of 900m<sup>2</sup> of canopy cover.

#### 3. MAIN ISSUES

##### 3.1. Arboricultural Impacts

- 3.1.1. Policy NH5 of the local plan requires that existing trees be protected, retained and sensitively incorporated into developments. Where loss of existing trees is demonstrably

unavoidable, planning permission will be granted where sufficient land is reserved for landscaping and appropriate replacement planting is provided.

- 3.1.2. In the main report, at paragraph 7.13.6, it is stated that the proposed level of replacement tree planting is appropriate in view of the space that would be available on the site following the development. Having received further advice from the council's Arboriculture Officer, that is no longer considered to be the case.
- 3.1.3. Whilst it is still recognised that the site is physically constrained and that there would be limited, if any, opportunity to provide replacement planting beyond the nine trees currently proposed, the resultant net loss of tree canopy cover would be such that the proposed replacement planting is not considered to be appropriate, as required by Policy NH5. In this respect, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy NH5.
- 3.1.4. The main report, at paragraph 7.13.8, also deals with concerns raised by the council's Arboriculture Officer regarding the protection of retained trees during and after the development. These concerns have been resolved, as the Arboriculture Officer is now satisfied that the submitted arboricultural impact assessment provides the details previously requested.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

- 4.1. The proposed loss of a total of 12 trees, with only nine replacements, is not considered to be appropriate and this represents a conflict with Policy NH5 of the local plan. Having regard to the extent of the loss, including the net loss in canopy cover, this carries moderate weight against granting permission.
- 4.2. However, it is considered that the significant benefits of the proposal, as set out in the main report, continue to outweigh the identified harms of the proposal, including the harms set out in the main report and the newly-identified harm to trees set out in this addendum. As such, the overall conclusion of officers remains unchanged i.e. that the proposal is contrary to the development plan but the benefits of the proposal, which are a material consideration, warrant the granting of permission.

---

**From:** Cycling UK Stevenage Campaigns  
**Sent:** 25 November 2025 14:46  
**To:** Plan Devcon  
**Subject:** [External] Planning Conditions for 25/00400/FPM for Lidl on Maxwell Road SG1 2EW

We note that planning application 25/00400/FPM for Lidl on Maxwell Road will come to the Planning and Development committee next Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> December.

Before the meeting, Cycling UK Stevenage would like to clarify an important aspect of the proposed conditions. Condition 24 refers only to cycle parking; there is no Condition addressing cycle access routes into the site, in accordance with the recommendations from HCC Highways.

In the officer's report, Access sections 7.10.4 and 7.10.5 refer only to pedestrian access from Maxwell Road and Gunnels Wood Road respectively. Unlike the developer's Transport and Access statement, there is no reference at all to cycle access.

Cycle parking is addressed extensively in the planning officer's report but there is no information at all about the access **routes** to it from the adjacent cycleway network.

The consultee response from HCC Highways makes specific note of issues that Cycling UK raised regarding access **routes** from the cycleway network to the cycle parking provision.

*"Before development commences, unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, details of cycling parking storage, **route**, provision and safety in accordance with National Guidance LTN-1, SP6 and with SBC Local Plan IT5 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority."*

*"Whilst the HA acknowledges the Stevenage cycleway system provides extensive cycle routes between the site and residential areas to the north, east, south and west of the site, as well as the town centre to the south-east, however the applicant has not shown details of the location of the staff cycle parking and location, furthermore Cycling UK Stevenage have identified a number of concerns, issues and improvements: HCC cycle officer feels these matters can be dealt with by way of planning condition."*

We are acutely aware that conditions to designate safe routes for people cycling to access the site and reach the cycle parking – without having to dismount and push their cycle - must be put in place at this stage.

Please could you confirm that, in line with the recommendation from the Highways Authority, Conditions about safe cycling **routes** will be included and made explicit at the Planning meeting?

Best Wishes

Jill Borcherds

On behalf of [Cycling UK Stevenage](#)

[Cycling UK](#) Cycle Advocacy Network

Campaigning to make cycling safe and accessible for everyone.