

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

ROYSTON & DISTRICT COMMITTEE

(Royston and Ermine Ward – Parishes of Barkway, Barley, Kelshall, Nuthampstead, Reed and Therfield)

**Meeting held at Royston Town Hall, Melbourn Street, Royston
on 21 December 2005 at 7.30 p.m.**

PRESENT: *Councillors W.M. Davidson (Chairman), Mrs F.R. Hill (Vice-Chairman), P.C.W. Burt, A.F. Hunter, R.E. Inwood, H.M. Marshall and F.J. Smith.*

IN ATTENDANCE: *Head of Strategy & Support Services, Head of Community Development & Cultural Services, Planning Control & Conservation Manager, Transport Policy Officer (Planning Policy), Area Planning Officer, Community Development Officer for Royston and Committee & Member Services Officer.*

ALSO PRESENT: *Adrian Redrup (Assistant North Herts District Manager – Royston Area (Hertfordshire Highways)) and Richard Boutal (Client Project Manager – Major Projects (Hertfordshire Highways)), County Councillor Doug Drake.*

75. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

76. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2005 be approved as a true record of the proceedings and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

Minute 60 – NHS Dental Services Provision for the Royston & District Area

- (1) It be noted that Rebecca Thornley no longer worked for the Royston, Buntingford, Bishops Stortford Primary Care Trust (PCT) and was attending the meeting in her capacity as a Contracting Manager working to support the Department of Health and Primary Care Trusts to facilitate contract implementation;
- (2) Paragraph 3 (below bullet points) – first sentence to be replaced with the following:
In response to questions from the Committee, Ms Poulain confirmed that the problems with lack of NHS dental services in some areas were not due to PCT management because local dental commissioning would only come into play from April 2006. In the past, dental services were purely at the discretion and at the will of a dental practice opening in the area. Other PCTs in the country that had inherited similar access problems were unable to influence the commissioning process until April 2006. PCTs would receive budgets in November and agree contracts by April 2006.

77. NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was submitted for consideration by the Committee.

78. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor A.F. Hunter declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 14 – Planning Applications: Margaret House, Church End, Barley – as a member of his family was a resident of Margaret House. Councillor Hunter reserved his right to speak and vote in relation to this item.

79. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr Alan Day had given due notice that he wished to speak at the meeting on behalf of the Coombelands Estate Residents Associations, regarding the proposed provision of a railway crossing for Royston.

Mr Day informed the Committee that the residents had serious concerns about what was considered to be a “disastrous planning mistake”, and that it would blight the lives of the 15 families in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site at Coombes Hole, robbing them of the right to enjoy their back gardens in peace and privacy. He also stated that the Residents Association had carried out their own survey in the area, and 71% of residents had been against the installation of a railway crossing at Coombes Hole, with 21% in favour, none of whom lived in the vicinity.

Mr Day stated that the main concerns of residents were:

- Light pollution from the crossing and access ramps needing to be constantly lit;
- Litter, which would inevitably be thrown into people’s back gardens;
- Noise from users, particularly drunken people returning from the town;
- Potential of damage to property, including but not limited to fencing;
- Vulnerability of the rear of neighbouring properties to crime.

Mr Day stated that problems were already experienced from people using the dirt track, and so provision of a proper structure which encouraged more people to use this route regularly would severely aggravate the problem.

Mr Day expressed the residents’ appreciation of the need for some form of crossing of the railway in Royston, but stated that this was not felt to be the appropriate location. From the options put forward in the consultation by Hertfordshire County Council, it was felt that the “least worst” would be the provision of a subway at the Morton Street/Green Street location as there was already a walkway/pavement in that vicinity that people used, and with the embankment the subway would not have to go so deep.

In conclusion, Mr Day asked the Committee and Hertfordshire County Council to seriously consider the effect any crossing would have on the lives and properties of residents in the vicinity of the site.

The Chairman thanked Mr Day for addressing the Committee.

Mr Robert Smith had given due notice that he wished to speak at the meeting regarding planning application reference 05/01561/1 – Land south of Redwing Rise, Royston. Mr Smith was speaking as an objector to the proposal, on behalf of the Templars Gate Residents Association.

Mr Smith welcomed the recommendations in the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control, and informed the Committee that a signature of more than 170 signatures and 103 letters and e-mails objecting to the application had been submitted directly to the planning officer by residents.

Mr Smith expressed disappointment that the residents’ concerns regarding vehicular access to the proposed site via Redwing Rise were not supportable as a reason for refusal, or their concerns regarding car parking provision. He also expressed their concern that enforcement proceedings were not initiated sooner against Twigdens for the breach of the Section 106 Agreement in relation to the provision of the Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP).

Mr Smith also stated that, whilst everyone is entitled to their own views, the members of the Templars Gate Residents Association did not agree with the suggestion that the inclusion of affordable housing would result in anti-social behaviour or cause problems for social integration.

The Chairman thanked Mr Smith for addressing the Committee and informed him that his presentation would be considered when the application was determined.

80. CONSULTATION ON THE PROVISION OF A RAILWAY CROSSING FOR ROYSTON

The Client Project Manager – Major Projects (Hertfordshire Highways) presented his report to the Committee which provided Members with feedback on the recent public consultation exercise regarding a potential new pedestrian / cycle crossing of the Great Northern Line Railway branch through Royston.

Section 4 of the report briefly set out the main issues for consideration by the Committee and a summary of the technical/consultation report was attached at Appendix 1. With the technical assessment of the various options available for a crossing provided in the report, this information was provided to assist the Committee in identifying the Council's preferred option for the provision of a new crossing in Royston.

The Chairman informed the Committee that the Community Development Officer for Royston had undertaken a similar consultation to that of Hertfordshire County Council with residents in the immediate vicinity of both the proposed sites, which had resulted in a 54% response rate (compared to a 21% response rate to the County Council's consultation exercise). The results of this were as follows:

Option	Number in Favour
Bridge at Coombes Hole	107
Bridge at Morton Street	85
Underpass at Coombes Hole	27
Underpass at Morton Street	61

The Committee informed the Client Project Manager – Major Projects (Hertfordshire Highways) that Coombes Hole, referred to in his report as the "Driftway", was not in fact owned by the District Council, but was owned half by the Royston Town Council, as owners of the allotments, and half by the immediate neighbours.

The Committee drew the attention of the Client Project Manager – Major Projects (Hertfordshire Highways) to the current practise by some residents of crossing over the bypass, alongside the bridge for the railway. It was therefore felt that it would be prudent to investigate the possibility of providing a low-cost short-term solution for this site which, whilst not necessarily the most convenient, was evidently used by pedestrians. Suggestions included installing a pedestrian and cycle walkway along either side of the bridge, with barriers to ensure that the vehicles and pedestrians remained separate.

The Committee acknowledged the concerns of the residents about the impact of the proposed crossing on their lives, and therefore stated that a "see-through" subway was the preferred option, provided the appropriate CCTV and lighting were included. The question was raised however about the frequency of problems with people crossing the railway line, as it was felt that the estimated figures quoted were a lot of money to be spent should there no longer be a problem.

The Client Project Manager – Major Projects (Hertfordshire Highways) acknowledged the comments made by the Committee and the clear preference for a subway solution rather than a bridge. He stated that he would contact the British Transport Police again to determine the evidence for the level of problems with people crossing the line still, and would feed the Committee's comments into the consultation process.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Client Project Manager – Major Projects (Hertfordshire Highways) be noted;

- (2) That the Committee's preference for a "see through" subway solution with associated lighting and CCTV monitoring at the Morton Street/Green Street site be identified as the Council's preferred option for a crossing in Royston;
- (3) That the Client Project Manager – Major Projects (Hertfordshire Highways) be requested to report back to this Committee by April 2006 with answers to questions raised by the Committee, and to provide any further update on progress with the project.

REASON FOR DECISION: To help the County Council make a judgement on the best way forward for this project.

81. IMPLEMENTATION PLANS OF THE MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES BEST VALUE FUNDAMENTAL SERVICE REVIEW

The Head of Strategy & Support Services presented her report to the Committee, which provided Members with an understanding of the proposals for developing and managing the implementation plans for the key outcomes of the Best Value Fundamental Service Review of the Museums and Galleries Service. The Committee was asked to make further suggestions of how to ensure that their local communities could be fully engaged in planning the new facilities proposed.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Head of Strategy & Support Services confirmed that the provision of additional storage for museums in the District, to include the Royston Museum, was included in the Action Plan and had been identified as an Action to be implemented as soon as possible.

RESOLVED: That the report of the Head of Strategy & Support Services be noted.

REASONS FOR DECISIONS:

- (1) Cabinet asked that all Area Committees be consulted in formulating and recommending proposals.
- (2) Area Committees with their strong local community links were ideally placed to sign post people to the Forum.
- (3) To allow Members to use their local knowledge of local consultation opportunities and events, which could be included in the Consultation Plans for this project.

82. DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: VEHICLE PARKING PROVISION AT NEW DEVELOPMENT AND ASSOCIATED SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The Transport Policy Officer (Planning Policy) presented a report of the Head of Planning and Building Control which sought the views of the Area Committee on the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Vehicle Parking Provision at New Development. This report had been referred to Area Committees by Cabinet as part of the formal six-week consultation period.

The draft SPD on Vehicle Parking at New Development had been circulated under separate cover to all members of the Committee, and was available on request for all other parties. The associated Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) had been provided for information in the Members' Room at the Council Offices, and copies of all three documents were available via the Council's website.

The Transport Policy Officer (Planning Policy) stated that the Committee could provide any further comments in writing to the Planning Policy department, or by e-mail to planning.policy@north-herts.gov.uk by 6 January 2006.

RESOLVED: That the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control be noted.

REASONS FOR DECISIONS:

- (1) There was a need for the Council to adopt guidance on vehicle parking at new development. To do this the Council would need to adopt a new SPD in line with national policy.
- (2) A draft version of the SPD had been made available for public consultation. The Area Committee views formed part of this consultation. In addition the draft SPD had to be the subject of draft SA and SEA, which had also been issued for public consultation.

83. INTEGRATED WORKS PROGRAMME 2006/2007 AND FORWARD WORKS PROGRAMME 2007-2011

The Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Royston Area (Hertfordshire Highways) presented a report of the Principal Strategy Development Manager (Hertfordshire Highways) to the Committee. The report had been referred to Area Committees by the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint Member Panel at its meeting held on 17 October 2005, and sought the Committee's comments on the proposed Integrated Works Programme (IWP) for 2006/2007, and the Forward Works Programme (FWP) for 2007-2011. These comments would constitute the formal feedback of the Joint Member Panel to the County Council's Transport Panel as part of the development of the IWP and FWP.

The Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Royston Area (Hertfordshire Highways) drew the Committee's attention to the two Plans, which were set out at Appendix A to the report.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Principal Strategy Development Manager (Hertfordshire Highways) be noted;
- (2) That the following comments and suggestions made by the Committee be passed to the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint Member Panel for incorporation into its formal feedback to the County Council's Transport Panel:
 - IWP – Scheme Delivery Plan – Item Ref. CWY061243 – Bell Lane Surface Dress: This is listed as Barley, but Bell Lane is in Nuthampstead. However, Putty Hall Cottages are in Barley – this is confusing! Also duplicated at item ref. CWY061272.
 - Lack of indication of priorities is disappointing
 - Many of the locations are unclear as only the road names are given, not the town names, and many of the towns have roads with the same names (e.g. Baldock Road)
 - Would be very helpful to have this listing broken into sections by Committee area when presented to Committees so that it easier to see at a glance the schemes which fall into each area
 - Surprised to see the inclusion of Elm Walk on the list (Items CWY061278 and CWY05162) as this road is in fairly good condition
 - Would like to see the following roads added, prioritised as listed:
 - 1) York Way, Royston – this road is starting to break up and a lot of complaints are being made, especially as it is used by heavy lorries which make a lot of noise and disturb the residents living next to the road. This road needed urgent attention and should be top if the listed roads;
 - 2) Melbourn Street, Royston;
 - 3) Baldock Road, Royston;
 - 4) Mill Road, Royston;
 - 5) Queens Road, Royston;
 - 6) Briary Lane, Royston

REASON FOR DECISIONS: The Committee was asked to use their local knowledge feedback any comments, either general or specific, on the composition and content of the IWP and FWP lists. All comments and responses would be passed onto the next meeting of the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint Member Panel and HCC's Highways and Transport Panel early in January 2006.

84. DRAFT ENHANCED HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME

The Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Royston Area (Hertfordshire Highways) presented a report of the Principal Strategy Development Manager which informed the Committee of the progress made on the current review of the Highway Maintenance Strategy. This report had also been referred to the Committee by the North Hertfordshire Highways Partnership Joint Member Panel at its meeting on 17 October 2005.

The Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Royston Area (Hertfordshire Highways) drew the Committee's attention to Appendix A to the report, which comprised the first draft of the North Herts Area Enhanced Maintenance Potential Programme List.

County Councillor Doug Drake stressed to the Committee that this report had been requested by Members of Hertfordshire County Council to investigate the possibility of an enhanced maintenance programme, and that no funding had been secured or agreement to the programme been made. It was therefore possible that the programme may not go ahead, and he stressed the importance of remembering this. He also informed the Committee that the engineers were now working to look at all footpaths in the County to look at where an enhanced spend could be used on them as well.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Principal Strategy Development Manager (Hertfordshire Highways) be noted;
- (2) That Members review the list and put forward any additional roads or changes they wished to make directly to the Assistant North Hertfordshire District Manager – Royston Area (Hertfordshire Highways), all feedback to be received by the end of December 2005.

REASONS FOR DECISIONS:

- (1) To secure the involvement of local Members in the development of the Highway Maintenance Strategy Review;
- (2) To ensure that local Members' views formed part of the formal consultation process for the Review and that those views were brought to the attention of the Hertfordshire County Council Transport Panel.

85. AREA GOVERNANCE

The Head of Community Development & Cultural Services presented a report to the Committee which set out an Action Plan in respect of the improvements that were proposed for the Council's approach to Area Governance and improved community engagement.

The report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services included the following appendices:

- a) Appendix 1 – Area Governance Action Plan – November 2005
- b) Appendix 2 – Possible Additional Delegation to Area Committees
- c) Appendix 3 – Guidance Notes for Area Chairmen
- d) Appendix 4 – Standing Orders for Area Committees.

The Head of Community Development & Cultural Services informed the Committee that the actions at sections A and B of the appendices were either in the process of

implementation, or had clear timescales for implementation, and drew their attention to paragraphs 9.3 and 9.4 which asked for input on some that were not determined. He also informed the Committee that the decision about whether to centralise the determination of planning applications would not be made until after the Audit Commission's report on Planning Services had been received, which was scheduled for early in 2006.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services be noted;
- (2) That the actions set out in Sections A and B of Appendix 1 to the report be approved;
- (3) That the actions set out in Section C of Appendix 1 to the report be approved, with the exception of numbers 48, 49 and 54, which would be considered further within the Service and Financial Planning process.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET: That, with regard to Action 54 set out in Section C of Appendix 1 to the report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services, the Committee felt that one of the best practices of the Authority was to determine planning applications at Area Committees and were therefore opposed to removing this function and changing to a central planning Committee.

REASON FOR DECISIONS: To ensure effective implementation of Area Governance.

86. CHAMPION NEWS

The Community Development Officer for Royston presented a report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services to the Committee, which advised them of the activities undertaken by the Community Development Officer for Royston since the meeting of the Committee held on 16 November, and brought to their attention some important community based activities that would be taking place during the next few months.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services be noted;
- (2) That the actions taken by the Community Development Officer for Royston to promote greater community capacity and well-being for Royston communities be endorsed.

REASON FOR DECISION: To keep members of the Committee apprised of the latest developments in community activities in Royston.

87. ANNUAL GRANTS AND DEVELOPMENT DISCRETIONARY BUDGET 2004/05

The Community Development Officer for Royston presented a report of the Head of Community Development & Cultural Services to the Committee, which set out the budgetary situation for the Committee, together with 2 additional grant applications that had been received.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the current expenditure and balance of the Development Budget be noted;
- (2) That expenditure in the sum of £267 for fencing repairs in Blake Close, Royston be ratified.

REASONS FOR DECISION:

- (1) The report was intended to apprise Members of the financial resources available to this Committee. It drew attention to the current budgetary situation, assisted in the effective financial management of the Committee's budget and ensured actions were performed within the Authority's Financial Regulations and the guidance contained in the Grants procedure;
- (2) The awarding of financial assistance to voluntary organisations and the use of discretionary spending allows the Committee to further the aims and strategic priorities of the Council.

88. GRANT APPLICATION – 1ST ROYSTON SCOUTS

RESOLVED: That the sum of £500 be awarded to the 1st Royston Scouts as a financial contribution toward the cost of replacement windows.

REASON FOR DECISION: The awarding of financial assistance to voluntary organisations and the use of discretionary spending allows the Committee to further the aims and strategic priorities of the Council.

89. GRANT APPLICATION – HERTS YOUNG HOMELESS GROUP

The Head of Community Development & Cultural Services outlined the funding application from the Herts Young Homeless Group to the Committee, and stated that they would normally be funded centrally but, as all central funds for the year had been committed, Cabinet had referred this to Area Committees for consideration. The proposal was for the Committee to contribute (pro rata) toward the cost of provision of advice services for the remainder of the financial year, following which the funding would be found from other sources

RESOLVED: That the sum of £412 be awarded to the Herts Young Homeless Group as interim financial support for the financial year 2005/2006.

REASON FOR DECISION: The awarding of financial assistance to voluntary organisations and the use of discretionary spending allows the Committee to further the aims and strategic priorities of the Council.

90. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee heard an oral representation from Mr Robert Smith with regard to planning application reference 05/01561/1. Details of this representation can be found above at Minute 79.

RESOLVED: To determine the applications as set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control as submitted to the Committee in the following schedule:

SCHEDULE

Reference Number	Description of Development and location	Decision
05/01561/1	Land south of Redwing Rise, Royston Erection of 28 detached, semi detached and terraced dwelling houses and 4 flats with garaging and car parking spaces, construction of roads, landscaping, provision of neighbourhood play area and ancillary works.	REFUSED (see (a) below)

05/01464/1	11 Perry Drive, Royston Erection of five dwellings comprising a terrace of 3 three-bedroom units facing Perry Drive and 2 three-bedroom units facing Mortimer Road following the demolition of existing bungalow. Rearrangement and marking out of existing parking lay-bys to provide a total of 18 car parking spaces and associated infrastructure. Application for approval of reserved matters (design, external appearance and landscaping) pursuant to outline planning permission no. 04/01808/1.	GRANTED (see (b) below)
05/01460/1	11 Perry Drive, Royston Erection of six dwellings comprising a terrace of 3 three-bedroom units facing Perry Drive and 2 three-bedroom units and 1 two-bedroom unit facing Mortimer Road following demolition of existing bungalow. Formation of vehicular access onto Perry Drive with the provision of nine off street parking spaces. Pedestrian access to Mortimer Road. Rearrangement and marking out of existing parking lay-bys to provide a total of 18 car parking spaces and associated infrastructure.	GRANTED (see (c) below)
05/01385/1	Margaret House, Church End, Barley Two storey side extension incorporating single storey front extension to existing Nursing Home to create 24 new bedrooms, 2 communal lounges and associated facilities following demolition of existing single storey 6 bedroom wing; additional 7 car parking spaces and ancillary works (amended scheme re-submitted following withdrawal of previous application – ref. 05/00531/1)	GRANTED (see (d) below)
05/01388/1LB	Margaret House, Church End, Barley Two storey side extension, incorporating single storey front extension to existing Nursing Home to create 24 new bedrooms, 2 communal lounges and associated facilities following demolition of existing single storey 6 bedroom wing; additional 7 car parking spaces and ancillary works (amended scheme re-submitted following withdrawal of previous application – ref. 05/00532/1LB)	GRANTED (as per report)

- (a) **RESOLVED:** That, with regard to planning application reference 05/01651/1, planning permission be **REFUSED** in accordance with the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control. It was further **RESOLVED** that the Head of Planning and Building Control, in co-operation with the Head of Legal & Democratic Services, be authorized to initiate enforcement/injunctive proceedings against the breach of the Section 106 obligation, following a period of three months in which officers will attempt to reach a negotiated settlement, therefore after 31 March 2006.
- (b) **RESOLVED:** That, with regard to planning application reference 05/01464/1, planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control, and the following additional condition:

5. *Notwithstanding the proposals set out in the applicant's tree survey, this approval of reserved matters does not extend to include the proposed lopping of the Lawson Cypress trees on the site, protected by a Tree Preservation Order. No works to these trees are therefore permitted.*

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of tree protection.

- (c) **RESOLVED:** That, with regard to planning application reference 05/01460/1, planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control, and the following additional condition:

15. *Notwithstanding the proposals set out in the applicant's tree survey, this planning permission does not extend to include the proposed lopping of the Lawson Cypress trees on the site, protected by a Tree Preservation Order. No works to the trees are therefore permitted by this permission.*

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of tree protection.

- (d) **RESOLVED:**

(1) That, with regard to planning application reference 05/1385/1, planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control, with the following altered and additional conditions:

6. *Before the occupation of any of the additional bedrooms hereby permitted, the car parking facilities shown on the approved plan shall be marked out and made available, and shall thereafter be kept available solely for the parking of motor vehicles associated with the care home*

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory car parking facilities clear of the public highway to meet the needs of the development.

7. *In addition to the requirements of condition 5 of this permission, the development shall not proceed otherwise than in conformity with detailed proposals of the manner in which it is intended to deal with all construction traffic throughout the duration of the building workings, including parking and turning facilities for delivery, service and construction workers vehicles, together with measures to control the movement of such vehicles into and out of the site, avoiding parking on, and disruption to the existing traffic situation along Church End.*

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and convenience along Church End.

10. *Before the timber boarded extension to Margaret House is demolished, preparatory to the extension hereby permitted, an evening bat survey shall be undertaken during the summer months to determine the existence or otherwise of a bat roost within the building. In the event of a roost being found then a mitigation strategy, method statement and works schedule shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in advance of any demolition work taking place within the site and thereafter implemented and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.*

Reason: To determine whether or not bats are roosting in the building to be demolished and if they are, to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented to protect the bat population in this area of the village.

11. *Before any of the rooms within the extension hereby permitted are first*

occupied, details of all measures to control light pollution from within the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and the residential amenities of occupiers of nearby properties

- (2) That the concerns of the Committee with regard to the problems with car parking in Church End, Barley be passed to the Highways Authority and to officers conducting North Hertfordshire District Council's Car Parking Review, in order that they can review the situation with a view to suggesting potential remedies.

91. PLANNING APPEALS

The Area Planning Officer informed the Committee that the following planning appeals had been lodged since the meeting of the Committee held on 16 November 2005:

Appellant	Mr and Mrs Ovens
Reference number	05/01425/1
Address	25 Priory Close, Royston
Proposal	Outline Application: Erection of 3 five-bedroom dwelling houses with associated garaging and car parking, access road and ancillary works. Replacement double garage to serve existing dwelling (landscaping reserved).
Method	Written representations

The Area Planning Officer informed the Committee that no planning appeals had been determined since the meeting of the Committee held on 16 November 2005.

The meeting closed at 10.22 p.m.

.....
Chairman