
PLANNING COMMITTEE**MINUTES**

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber at Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth on Thursday 23 September 2021 from 7.30pm to 8.47pm.

Councillors present:

Steve Drury (Chair)	Ruth Clark
Raj Khiroya (Vice Chair)	Keith Martin
Sara Bedford	Debbie Morris
Reena Ranger (sub for Cllr Alex Hayward)	Chris Lloyd
Stephen Cox (sub for Cllr Stephen King)	
David Raw	
Alison Scarth	

Also in attendance: Cllr Craig Coren Batchworth Community Council.

Officers: Claire Westwood, Matthew Roberts, Alex Laurie and Sarah Haythorpe

PC 53/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Stephen King and Alex Hayward with Councillors Stephen Cox and Reena Ranger as the named substituted Members.

PC 54/21 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 12 August 2021 and the reconvened Planning Committee meeting held on 19 August 2021 were confirmed as a correct record by the Committee and were signed by the Chair.

PC 55/21 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair advised that item 5 Consideration of Objections and Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order 923 (Manor House, Abbots Langley) 2020, the report had been published on time however, some background papers had been published later. The Chair had agreed to take the report and background papers as urgent so the Committee could make a decision on the TPO.

PC 56/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Reena Ranger declared a pecuniary interest in item 9 and would leave the meeting for this application.

Councillor Stephen Cox advised that as a Ward Councillor they had been present and involved in meetings with Council staff and residents at Ann Shaw Gardens. Notwithstanding this, the Councillor would approach planning application 21/1669/FUL (Installation of 'catch-ball' net fencing to eastern boundary of play area at ANN SHAW GARDENS PLAY AREA, SOUTH

OXHEY, WATFORD, WD19 7AT) made by Three Rivers District Council with an open mind and on its planning merits in accordance with the development plan and along with any material planning considerations.

Councillors Ruth Clark and Sara Bedford declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5 as a Member of Abbots Langley Parish Council but would remain for the item and vote.

Councillor Steve Drury read out the following statement to the Committee:

“All Members are reminded that they should come to meetings with an open mind and be able to demonstrate that they are open minded. You should only come to your decision after due consideration of all the information provided, whether by planning officers in the introduction, by applicants/agents, by objectors or by fellow Councillor’s. The Committee Report in itself is not the sole piece of information to be considered. Prepared speeches to be read out are not a good idea. They might suggest that you have already firmly made up your mind about an application before hearing any additional information provided on the night and they will not take account of information provided on the night. You must always avoid giving the impression of having firmly made up your mind in advance no matter that you might be pre-disposed to any view.”

PC 57/21 Consideration of objections and confirmation of Tree Preservation Order (TPPO) 923 (Manor House, Abbots Langley) 2020

The Principal Tree and Landscape Officer provided some background details on the report and advised that 5 objections had been received to the TPO which were outlined in the report.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke against the making of the TPO.

Councillor Reena Ranger said the trees were located on common land and asked if the neighbours and residents understood who owned the Land and who the trees belonged to? The Officer believed the trees stood on Parish Council land or land that was leased to Abbots Langley Parish Council by the Council as they were responsible for the maintenance of the trees. There was a narrow strip of land between the boundary that the trees stood on and the rear of the properties which was believed to be privately owned.

Councillor Sara Bedford knew some of the land was on a long lease from the County Council and that the Parish Council paid a five figure sum to buy in the services of an arboriculturist to look at the safety of all the trees in the public areas. The trees were visible from Stanfield, the High Street and Gallows Hill Lane and were beautiful trees and thought it was not unreasonable to have TPOs placed on them and have any work authorised and carried out in a manner to preserve them.

The Chair advised that there were 2 options available to the Committee.

Option 1 - To confirm the Order and make the TPO permanent.

Option 2 - Not to confirm the Order, and allow the TPO to lapse.

Councillor Sara Bedford moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen Cox the recommendation for Option 1 – to confirm the Order and make the TPO permanent

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous/by general assent.

RESOLVED:

That the Order should be confirmed, and TPO923 made permanent.

PC 58/21

21/1059/FUL – Internal alterations, the installation of a flue from a gas pizza oven on the side elevation and alterations to frontage to include new signage at SHOP 4 WALPOLE BUILDING, CHURCH STREET, RICKMANSWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD3 1BU

The Planning Officer reported there were no updates but wanted to reiterate and make sure it was clear, there had been a previous application which Members had considered at the end of last year which was refused but that related to a change of use. This application was regarding internal alterations and some alterations to the frontage which tie in with the advertisement consent which had been previously granted. There was no change of use proposed.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved that Planning Permission be Granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report, seconded by Councillor Keith Martin.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

PC59/21

21/1337/FUL - Variation of Condition 16 (Construction Management Plan) of planning permission 19/0455/FUL (Demolition of garages and erection of two detached dwellings with associated parking and access) to remove wording requiring majority of construction traffic to use Eastbury Avenue at LAND AT THE REAR OF THE LIMES, 9 EASTBURY AVENUE, NORTHWOOD, HERTFORDSHIRE

The Planning Officer reported that following discussions with Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) it was confirmed that the parking bays to the front of the application site were maintained by them. Additionally, the bays currently have no parking restrictions and therefore no prior agreement is required from TRDC or HCC to suspend their use for parking. However the land subject to the bays is owned by Maclean Homes Ltd so prior agreement would be required between both parties prior to construction works. In light of this it was necessary and reasonable to ensure that evidence of prior agreement was sought before works commenced. The Planning Officer therefore proposed to amend Condition C16 (Construction Management Plan) to read:

“No development shall take place whatsoever until evidence in writing has been provided to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) demonstrating that prior agreement has been secured from the land owner to temporarily suspend the

use of the parking bays throughout the construction phase as shown at Figure 3 within the revised Construction Management Plan, version 2, Page 12. Following confirmation from the Local Planning Authority in writing that such agreement establishes the right to suspend the parking bays all development shall be undertaken in full compliance of the Construction Management Plan, Version 2 prepared by Southdown Safety prepared on behalf of Westfield Homes Ltd and shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.”

HCC had also confirmed that the swept path drawings were acceptable and having spoken to Environmental Protection they had confirmed that the refuse trucks used to go down East Glade and Holbein Gate are a height of 3.75 metres, a width of 2.5 metres and a length of 11.25 metres. Environmental Protection also confirmed they had no issues with collections to East Glade and Holbein Gate as a result of the size of the refuse trucks which are larger than the vehicles set out within the revised Construction Management Plan (CMP). Members would have also seen sight of a letter from the Director of The Limes which was sent today stating that the applicant had no legal right to access to The Limes.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the application and another member of the public spoke against the application.

Batchworth Community Councillor Craig Coren spoke on the application stating that at the time of the original application Batchworth Community Council had objected to the application with the reasons set out in the report. In the event that the Committee were minded to grant permission to the variation requested they felt that the proposed CMP needed enhancing to look after the residents and wished to put forward the following points:

- The developer works closely with the residents with assistance from the Community Council;
- At Clause 8.2 it talks about part loaded vehicles but this needs tightening as it would be impossible to control;
- Clause 8.2b it talks about large deliveries but from experience this would cause congestion and deliveries should be booked more than two days in advance with greater notice given to the site management team and the local residents;
- Unless comprehensive CCTV was installed all the neighbours would have to take the burden of monitoring and ensuring that the CMP was followed. CCTV would ensure that there was an independent eye overlooking the development;
- It was noted that the developers were intending to have a banks person at the front but from experience they are not always available when required;
- On Clause 8.4 they suggested a reduction in the delivery hours so to avoid the peak traffic hours in the neighbourhood (morning and evenings);
- Clause 9 shows the extent of the vehicle arrangements during the construction and should lead to other clauses being tightened up as there would be a lot more movement than people imagine;

- Clause 10 shows the site is very tight, see figure 3, and assurance would be needed on where materials were to be located when delivery vehicle are on site. This had to be maintained for the full 52 weeks of the contract. The set down area and the materials storage area both seemed insufficient;
- Clause 12 would need to be monitored as there was a serious chance of the Construction Management Plan failing;
- There was a reference to contractors and individuals on site not parking close by and using local car parks to park however there was no actual indication as to where they are going to park and no strong assurances.

The Planning Officer stated the condition requiring the majority of the access from Eastbury Avenue was part of the original application which also involved development at The Limes where two flats were being added on top of the flatted development as well as these two homes. That permission had now expired and this application had been brought forward on its own independent from The Limes and the ownership follows that. The Limes was now outside of the red line and there was no control by the applicant to provide construction traffic access from Eastbury Avenue. The report does say that it would be an unreasonable request to maintain this condition and refuse the application. As the speaker for the application had advised generally a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is not put forward for a scheme of this size however there is one for this development which would provide more control than other sites within the District. Members should be cautious about any further requests they may wish to make as officers consider the CMP to be acceptable and it had been amended to not have any parking in Holbein Gate and East Glade. How the developer and builder works around the parking arrangements would be solely down to them. Enforcement would be engaged if any construction vehicles are found within East Glade or Holbein Gate as it would be a breach of the condition. On the CCTV it would be an unreasonable request and there had been no reason put forward so far as to why it would be required. The site would be no different to any other site which do not have CCTV included in their CMP. On the banks persons this was a mitigation measure to help with the manoeuvring to and from the site. This was not always proposed but this was a further mitigation measure to try and reduce the impact on residents and any conflict with the construction vehicles. On deliveries, Officers had already considered what was set out in the CMP and considered this to be acceptable. If there were to be any further restrictions they needed to be very solid planning reasons.

Councillor Debbie Morris was familiar with the site. The site had been the subject of multiple applications since 2014. Residents over the years had been upset about some of the schemes but had now accepted the permitted schemes which had been approved. However, their acceptance of them was on the basis of what had been previously approved and the CMP was key to the residents of this part of East Glade and Holbein Gate. The Councillor reminded Members on the planning history of the site since 2017 and that the CMP had been required to ensure that the majority of construction traffic went through The Limes. The reason for that was to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway. The Councillor referred to the officer report at point 7.1.7 where they were recommending approval and

stating that the current condition was no longer necessary but the Councillor questioned "Why was it no longer necessary". The site circumstances of the surrounding properties had not changed and half the buildings had not disappeared. There were still 15 individual houses within the proximity of this construction area and were all occupied. The Planning Officer had advised the condition was no longer reasonable but Members had been told that ownership was not a material planning consideration so if the ownership of the land had switched why was that something which does not cause the officer to change the recommendation? If it was now no longer reasonable why was it necessary and reasonable 2/3 years ago and why would it not be reasonable now. The Planning Officer had also said it would prevent the development from being deliverable but the Councillor said it wouldn't as whilst they accepted that there had been a transfer of land ownership the site was not a whole anymore and there could have been the opportunity in the context of that transfer to allow access for the construction traffic through The Limes. Whether this was not undertaken through negligence or commercial risk the Member did not know but there were a variety of events which could block the driveway which included a sink hole but they could not see why vehicles could not go along there. It was a question of the two neighbours being in dispute coming to an agreement to allow the traffic to go along the drive as agreed previously and did not think the LPA should be taking sides in order to facilitate a change in something that was endorsed on previous occasions.

Councillor Sara Bedford could not recall what had been said or what they said on the previous applications when they came to Committee but they could guess that what they had said was using a small cul-de-sac behind the development for construction vehicles to access the site was not reasonable. They could not be sure of that but would think that was what they thought at the time. Whilst they were not opposed to development they were opposed to development that unreasonably disrupts residents. There was no doubt that using the access via the cul-de-sacs was going to unreasonably disrupt the existing residents. Like Councillor Morris they could not see why Members were being told that because the land ownership had changed the condition must change. Planning permission runs with the land and does not run with the owner/building. The Member did not know what the relationship was with the owners of the two plots of land but to say we don't now have an arrangement to use the land, are not able to implement the permission we have been given and need to have a new permission to allow us to cause the disruption that you did not want us to cause in the first place seems totally unreasonable. When the permissions were granted 2/3 years ago Members would not have wanted to cause disruption to the residents and this would have been a very high priority and finding a way for it not to cause disruption may have tipped the balance on the application receiving permission. At the very least if there was no other way of doing it then hours of access should be severely limited, the number of vehicles severely limited and there should be no parking within the area. Conditions were put on applications for a reason and which we think are necessary at the time and if they were not necessary they would not be allowed by the officers to put them on.

Councillor Stephen Cox said they could speak with some authority on residents being disrupted by construction due to the developments taking place in South Oxhey. Clearly Members want to minimise the effect of the development on

residents but they could not understand the reasons why access from Eastbury Avenue could not be provided or used.

The Planning Officer reported that in terms of access from Eastbury Avenue the management/owners of The Limes had made it clear that they would never give a right of access to the construction/application site. If this permission was not approved then there would be no means of getting construction access other than East Glade/Holbein Gate. The previous condition also did not completely restrict construction traffic from East Glade/Holbein Gate it purely said the majority of large construction vehicles should go down the Eastbury Avenue entrance. If this application was to come in simply as two new dwellings on this plot the red line would be solely around the application site with access from Holbein Gate. If we were looking at this application would we be saying to ourselves that they have to use an access on the adjoining site which was not within their ownership? Unfortunately in the officer's opinion they would not be because we would be saying they have to come via Holbein Gate and East Glade to make the construction site deliverable for these two homes. Therefore we should be looking at minimising disruption and we would do that by agreeing the CMP which had been submitted. If that was not robust enough then it should be tightened and strengthened by Members with valid reasons and officers can go away with the developer to consider such changes and bring it back to the Committee. The land had been transferred and the planning condition was only enforceable under those who have got the control and it was an unreasonable condition to impose on the applicant because they would never be able to discharge it. In the report it states that the condition was no longer necessary; however, this was incorrect because a CMP is necessary as highlighted earlier but not necessary in terms of the wording put forward by the developer.

Councillor Reena Ranger had no objection to the principle of the development but what Members were asking for was fairness. What was being discussed was a civil matter and not a planning matter and should have been sorted out before the purchase or completion of the deal on the land so that these matters did not arise. It was not for Members to speculate on whether planning permission would have been granted for two dwellings. Looking at the photographs Members could see two cars parked in the parking bays. There are already parking pressures on the street and parking restrictions in neighbouring roads. The road is narrow, it is cul-de-sac and the concerns would be as before safety and access for emergency vehicles. Parking provision in the area is difficult and there is a development nearby with a turntable due to lack of space and parking. If you look at the table 4 in the CMP having six large vehicles a day between the hours of 8.30 to 4.30pm was a huge number when you already have people on site from 8am to 8pm. Where would all these vehicles be held if they did not arrive on time and not for their allocated slot. The nearest place would be Eastbury Avenue. There are two schools in close proximity and Eastbury Avenue is a busy road which had its own pressures with houses becoming flats which had increased car movements. Item 14 in the CMP stated that public transport would be used but we don't have public transport access nearby and the local NCP car park was located in the neighbouring London Borough of Hillingdon which was 15-20 minutes away and if you are walking with any form of a material it was somewhat of a trek. How would this be feasible and how would it work. If you had a big articulated

lorry how would you reverse out of the site? We are the planning authority in charge of pollution and the Councillor wondered how we were going to measure that and if there was something not being undertaken. With the CMP are we asking residents to advise us if something was not complied with but can we get enough enforcement officers there to ensure they do comply. On point 8.3 of the CMP if this application was to be passed it stated that residents would be adequately warned of disruption and asked what this would mean i.e. 24 hours or 48 hours before.

Councillor Steve Drury noted the concerns raised by Members on this application and wondered whether the application should be deferred to allow officers to talk to the contractors and maybe a site visit for those Members who had not been to this particular application site.

The Planning Officers said this was feasible and could understand Members comments on the impact on residents but there would be restrictions on the developer and restrictions on the vehicles accessing the site. But if Members needed more information officers would need a steer on what items they need to discuss with the developer.

Councillor Debbie Morris was not in favour of deferral as they thought that enough information had been provided. The Planning Officer had advised that if the application was refused there would be no means of getting access but repeated their point that there was means of access but it might not be a lawful permitted means yet but that was for the two parties to discuss and not a matter for the LPA. If there was to be a new application we would not be thinking like this but it was not a new application and applications on the site had been going on for 7 years and Members were not able to pretend it was a new application. The letter referring to the transfer document was that they brought the site in early 2019 but this condition was put on 2017 on the previous permission. So either the applicant had not done due diligence or their lawyers had not or both or decided to take a risk but that was not a problem for Members and not something to be imposed on residents. 6/7 large vehicle movements a day when you are used to having 1 or 2 a week was a gross imposition on the residents and their residential amenity, the parking provision in this part of the road with probably no more than four on street parking places excluding the parking bays that have been taken out between 15 houses. If the 15 houses had visitors, work people, carers, grandchildren visit it would just be unreasonable. They knew the developer had said no parking on East Glade and Holbein Gate but at various points in the CMP they had spoken about parking in local car parks but it had been pointed out this was 15 minutes' walk away and was totally unreasonable. This end of Eastbury Avenue had double yellow lines and although there was a small area outside a couple of flats for 6-8 vehicles but these spaces are always taken up so there would be even more pressure on those spaces. In the officer report they had said that Holbein Gate and East Glade are clearly not designed for big construction vehicles so why were officers proposing that it was.

Councillor Stephen Cox referred to the site visit but it was clear to them that if the application was to go ahead with access via Holbein Gate and East Glade they could not see how it could be turned down with a proper enforceable CMP so they were not convinced a site visit would add anything.

Councillor David Raw asked that the photo of Eastbury Avenue be shown to the Committee and show where The Limes was located.

The Planning Officer showed the map and highlighted to the Committee the proposed route the construction vehicles would take to the site on the photograph. They advised that no works were proposed to the flatted development so if construction traffic was to go through from Eastbury Avenue this would impact on the residents in The Limes and should be considered.

Councillor Sara Bedford asked about the previous applications on the site and the reports on them. Did The Limes and the application site use to be in the same ownership. The Planning Officer confirmed this was correct.

Councillor Sara Bedford said following this confirmation officers were saying it would be unreasonable to go past the neighbours in The Limes. But when the owners of the sites applied for planning permission they knew that the access given was to go up the side of The Limes inconveniencing the people who lived there to gain access onto the site behind. That was not an issue in 2017 or 2019 but it was now. There was a price on moving that fence to gain access via Eastbury Avenue and that was what needed to happen as that was what the Committee gave permission on. The owners of the land had made a decision to split the ownership and then come back and say we can't do it now as we are not talking to each other. This was not the LPA's problem or the residents. They got permission on the basis that they could use that access. There was no point having a site visit as you can go and have a look and see how it looks without people knowing and can get a much better idea of the area. Having the new access arrangements would not be reasonable. Bearing in mind what the Planning Officer had said and their professional opinion Members have a duty to look at these things and to see what we granted permission for. This was different to what we were now being asked to grant permission and did not think it was reasonable on the existing residents.

If Councillor Morris was edging towards proposing refusal the Councillor would be happy to support that.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved refusal on the grounds of adverse impact on the existing residential amenity as a result of the huge amount of increased construction traffic, the noise, pollution, dirt, the inconvenience, impact on parking pressures on the street and potential obstruction by construction vehicles which fails to minimise danger.

Councillor Sara Bedford also wished to query the details provided by HCC on the previous application when they recommended the majority of construction movement to be made through the existing access from Eastbury Avenue and could not see how they could suddenly change their mind and say it was now okay. What was factually correct in 2017 and 2019 can't now be incorrect in 2021.

Councillor Debbie Morris moved that Planning Permission be Refused, seconded by Councillor Sara Bedford who also asked if the words on the grounds of highways safety and access could be considered.

The Planning Officer had heard Members views and taken on board Members concerns and wish for the original condition to still be imposed. Members did

have the ability to refuse the application and the final wording to be circulated to Members if the Committee do agree to refuse the application.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 9 For, 1 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

The variation of Condition 16 (Construction Management Plan) of 19/0455/FUL to remove the ability to utilise the existing vehicular access from Eastbury Avenue for the large majority of construction vehicle movements to and from the highway would, by virtue of the volume and type of construction related movements to and from the site, result in unnecessary obstructions, conflict and inconvenience to users and residents of Eastglade and Holbein Gate, thereby resulting in highway safety concerns. In addition, the impact from the volume of construction traffic and the size of construction vehicles combined with the ineffective wording of the revised Construction Management Plan in respect of on-site controls and impractical parking solutions would fail to adequately minimise danger to users of the highway, exacerbate parking pressures locally and lead to unacceptable levels of noise and pollution which would also be detrimental to the residential amenities of those within Eastglade and Holbein Gate. As such, the requested variation of Condition 16 would be contrary to CP1 and CP10 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and DM9 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

PC60/21 21/1563/FUL - Single-storey front and side extensions at HOLLY HEDGES FARM, OLLEBERRIE LANE, BELSIZE, WD3 4NU

The Planning Officer reported there was no update.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Sara Bedford thought the comments in point 7.1.10 and 7.1.8 summed up very neatly why this was not an unreasonable application despite its isolated Green Belt location. One of the ways we preserve the countryside was to have people living in it. Where there are existing dwellings we should be encouraging people to live in them and be able to have a reasonable sized modern house. The Councillor moved that Planning Permission be Granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd. Councillor Lloyd noted that the application had been called in by Sarratt Parish Council and wondered if they were attending the meeting or had given a reason why they were not at the meeting as they would have liked to have heard their views.

The Planning officer advised that initially they did not have sight of the plans but the Case Officer did go back to them with the plans which they saw. As Members can see from the report they still wished the application to come to Committee. The reasons for them calling the application in were clarified in the officer report at point 7.1.10.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 10 For, 0 Against and 1 Abstention.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

Councillor Reena Ranger left the meeting.

PC61/21 21/1586/FUL – Demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of a replacement dwelling with associated hard and soft landscaping at 29 BEDFORD ROAD, MOOR PARK, HA6 2AY

The Planning Officer reported that there was no update but some Members who had been on the Committee a while may recall that an application was considered by the Committee and ultimately approved following amendments in August 2018. This application had not been implemented within the 3 year period therefore this new application had been submitted. Essentially it was the same as the previous application permitted in August 2018.

Councillor Chris Lloyd said as it was the same application as 3 years ago they would move that Planning Permission be Granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report, seconded by Councillor Raj Khiroya.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 8 For, 0 Against and 2 Abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

Councillor Reena Ranger re-joined the meeting.

PC62/21 21/1669/FUL – Installation of ‘catch-ball’ net fencing to eastern boundary of play area at ANN SHAW GARDENS PLAY AREA, SOUTH OXHEY, WATFORD, WD19 7AT

The Planning Officer reported that there was no update. Photographs were shown the Committee illustrating where the proposed netting would be. No comments had been received on the application.

Councillor Stephen Cox said the minute the gardens were turned into a lovely play area local people wished to play football and sometimes were erratic in their shooting and the ball often landed in the garden of 16 Ferryhills Close which had caused a lot of problems. This solution seemed the best way to proceed. Once the laurel bushes had grown to their full height it would stop the balls going into the garden. The application had come forward following a meeting with the residents, officers and Councillors.

Councillor Stephen Cox moved that Planning Permission be Granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report, seconded by Councillor Chris Lloyd.

Councillor Sara Bedford asked for details on the exact form of fencing as they knew of two areas in their Ward where fences were put up for this purpose but

had found they made a lot of noise when a ball was kicked on them so can we be sure it was not a type which makes lots of noise when a ball is kicked against it.

The Planning Officer understood it was mesh fencing but would discuss with Leisure colleagues to ensure that noise from vibrations had been considered. Checks would be done before the fence was put up.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be Granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer report.

Chair