

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Alex Howard.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
24/01347/FP	Erection of one detached 3-bed dwelling following demolition of existing garage including installation of hardstanding and associated works.	38 Heathfield Royston Hertfordshire SG8 5BN

Submitted Plan Nos

481.01C 481.02 481.03A 481.04 481.06 481.06A 481.07 481.08 481.09 PR279-01B PR279-02A

1.0 Policies

SP2 Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Distrib

SP9	Design and Sustainability
D1	Sustainable design
D3	Protecting living conditions
T2	Parking
NE4	Biodiversity and geological sites
SECN12	Achieving well-designed places

2.0 **Site History**

- 2.1 **23/00830/FP** - Erection of one single storey 3-bed residential dwelling following demolition of existing garage including alterations to existing vehicular access/driveway and associated works.

Refused – Appeal Dismissed

3.0 **Representations**

- 3.1 **Royston Town Council** – *“Members of Royston Town Council raised an OBJECTION to this application as it is an overdevelopment of the site. If the application does proceed then all of the trees on the site must be preserved”.*

The Ward Cllr formally wrote in stating that they were minded to call this application in to Planning Control Committee should Officers be minded to recommend approval.

- 3.2 **Hertfordshire Highways** – None received.
- 3.3 **Environmental Heath (Land Contamination)** – No objection.
- 3.4 **Environmental Health (Air Quality)** – No objection subject to condition.
- 3.5 **Environmental Heath (Noise and Nuisances)** – No objection.
- 3.6 **Site Notice and Neighbour Consultation** – *“Further development such as this proposed splitting of existing plots such as this will increase the road traffic on the*

private Heathfield Road, progressively increasing wear and repair and renewal costs for the residents which is not an acceptable trend. Progressive splitting of existing of plots will destroy the balance, aesthetics, noise levels, air, and light pollution levels of this well-established neighbourhood. Increased vehicle traffic, parking and pollution will result and is not a positive trend that will not be acceptable to the majority of residents here in Heathfield. It does not get my acceptance or that of my husband, thus this registered objection”.

- 3.7 **North Herts Ecologist** – *“Thank you for consulting me, having considered the excel BNG metric and assessment I would have no ecological objection to the proposal.*

Whilst the development would fail to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity on site this is recognised by the applicant and it is proposed that 0.26 individual tree units could be purchased, along with 0.10 units of any habitat type, from an off-site BNG unit provider in order to meet the statutory requirement.

As the proposal is contained within a private garden there is no opportunity to deliver gains that would count towards a metric score on site and hence an off-site solution is acceptable. A degree of landscaping and planting is proposed in association with the new build which would still deliver some benefit.

As such, should the application be approved, the following condition wording is advised;

Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition “(the biodiversity gain condition)” that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.*

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission would be North Herts Council. Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply”.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 The site is the rear garden of 38 Heathfield, which is a detached bungalow located within the built-up area of Royston. The site backs onto Green Drift, a residential estate located to the north of Heathfield. There is an existing access to No.38 from Heathfield. The general character along Heathfield comprises detached properties, that back onto Green Drift. To the west of the site is an exception to the general character where a detached property at 40 Heathfield sits behind a smaller bungalow. The neighbouring property at No.40 does however share its vehicular access onto Heathfield the smaller bungalow behind it. This means that No.40 continues to back onto Green Drift with fencing and landscaping along the roadside.

4.2 **Proposal**

- 4.2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the erection of one detached 3-bed dwelling following demolition of existing garage, including installation of hardstanding and associated works.
- 4.2.2 The dwelling is designed to replicate the existing bungalow immediately due west behind No.40 Heathfield. The bungalow would measure approx. 13.6m wide and 9.5m deep, with a front element projecting approx. 3.5m. The eaves would measure approx. 2.5m in height, with a dual-hipped roof incorporating half-hipped elements measuring approx. 6.5m in height. The bungalow would be finished in dark coloured vertical timber cladding, slate roof tiles, and black aluminium windows/doors. The proposal would incorporate 2 parking spaces, a turning point, cycle/bin storage and private amenity space. The proposal would be facilitated by the removal of an existing attached garage, which would allow the existing access to be extended past the host dwelling to the proposed plot. The site plan indicates that the existing access to the host dwelling from Heathfield is to be retained with a narrower access road, which will see all of the trees and landscaping on the front and side boundary retained, whilst also proposing additional planting on the side boundary with No.38 and the rear boundary with Green Drift.

4.3 **Key Issues**

- 4.3.1 The key issues in this case are:

- ☐ Principle of Development
- ☐ Planning History
- ☐ Sustainability
- ☐ Impact on the Character of the Area
- ☐ Layout and Design
- ☐ Impact on Future Occupiers/Neighbours
- ☐ Highways, Access, and Parking
- ☐ Landscaping

Principle of Development

- 4.3.2 Policy SP2 of the Local Plan states that the majority of the district's housing development will be located within the settlement boundaries of the major towns. Royston is one of the major towns in North Herts and the site is within the settlement boundary. As such, the site is considered sustainable and appropriate for new housing development. The principle of development is therefore acceptable, in accordance with Policy SP2 of the Local Plan.

Sustainability

- 4.3.3 The overarching purpose of the planning system is to contribute to achieving sustainable development, as stated in Section 2 of the NPPF. This is considered against the three objectives of sustainable development, the economic, social, and environmental objectives.
- 4.3.4 Firstly, in terms of the economic objective, the proposed development would see the delivery of jobs during the build/construction phase which is a benefit. Secondly, in terms of the social objective, this proposal would add an additional dwelling to the districts housing figures which could be delivered in a relatively short space of time. Lastly, in terms of the environmental objective, the proposal would incorporate some sustainable building features, such as an EV charging point. Furthermore, compared to the previous submission, there is a considerable amount of green landscaping to be

retained on all boundaries and this will be enhanced with new landscaping on the side and rear of the site.

- 4.3.5 Overall, on the grounds of sustainability, the economic and social benefits of the proposal are very modest which is relative to the scale of development being one dwelling. Moreover, relatively speaking for a single dwelling scheme, there would be some environmental benefits through the incorporation of sustainable building features and retained/new landscaping. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development meets the three objectives of sustainability.

Planning History

- 4.3.6 This site was subject to a previous planning application under ref: 23/00830/FP for the 'Erection of one single storey 3-bed residential dwelling following demolition of existing garage including alterations to existing vehicular access/driveway and associated works.' This application was refused on the 26th June 2023 for the following reason:

"The proposed development, by virtue of its back-land nature in the context of the prevailing pattern and character of development in Heathfield would result in material harm to the spacious, verdant quality and character of the area. The existing dwelling to the rear of No.40 does not set any kind of precedent in the locality and therefore, the scheme would not respond positively to the site's local context. The relatively modest benefits associated by this proposal would not be outweighed by the harm identified above. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies SP9 and D1 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 12 of the NPPF".

- 4.3.7 This refused application was appealed to the Planning Inspectorate under ref: APP/X1925/W/23/3326023, where it was dismissed on the 9th April 2024 with the Inspector concluding as follows:

"Whilst I have had full regard to the benefits of this proposal, the information submitted does not demonstrate that the development overall, would not result in considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would result in more surfacing, less landscaping, and a greater perception of uncharacteristic in-depth development. This environmental harm would also represent poor design in this context. I conclude that the matters in support of the proposal, including the lack of local objections, are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal".

Impact on the Character of the Area

- 4.3.8 Policy D1 of the Local Plan states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that respond positively to the sites local context and create or enhance the public realm. Policy SP9 of the Local Plan further considers that new development will be supported where it is well designed and located and responds positively to its local context. This is echoed in Section 12 of the NPPF.
- 4.3.9 This proposed development is almost a carbon copy of the proposal refused under application ref: 23/00830/FP, with only some minor changes to the proposed layout insofar as it relates to the access point/road off Heathfield and the extent of retained and enhanced landscaping. For this reason, many of the considerations under the previous application remain material to this application and will be reiterated.
- 4.3.10 Firstly, it is acknowledged at this stage that the proposed development has been designed to replicate the general form and layout of the existing bungalow immediately due west behind No.40 Heathfield, which was approved under ref: 99/00365/1. The

proposed bungalow would almost mirror the scale of the dwelling itself, the formation of the shared access down the side of the host dwelling, and the amount of private amenity space, which could be seen as responding to local context.

4.3.11 However, the general character of properties on this part of Heathfield are detached dwellings benefitting from long, wide rear gardens that back onto Green Drift, with the property behind No.40 being the only anomaly to that prevailing character. That existing bungalow was permitted in 1999, which pre-dates the NPPF and is arguably a different era for planning considerations. Therefore, whilst acknowledging the existence of the bungalow to the rear of No.40, this does not set any kind of precedent for similar development. Back-land development such as that proposed, would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area, eroding the spacious quality that currently exists which can be appreciated from both Heathfield and Green Drift.

4.3.12 Further to this point, an application for a detached single-storey dwelling was refused by North Herts Council under ref: 19/00667/FP for the plot of land to the rear of No.42 Heathfield, which is the opposite side of the No.40 relative to the application site. This decision was appealed to the Planning Inspector under ref: APP/X1925/W/19/3231769 and dismissed. This is a material consideration, and the following will consider the similarities and differences between that proposal and this scheme.

4.3.13 It is noteworthy from the outset that the fundamental difference between the appeal scheme and the current application is the orientation and access arrangements. The appeal scheme was proposed to have a frontage and access facing onto Green Drift, where there are no existing frontages or access facing this way, which was deemed contrary to the pattern and character of the area. The application scheme would front and be accessed from Heathfield, which would retain the character and pattern of the area insofar as it is viewed from Green Drift.

4.3.14 However, whilst the orientation and access arrangements are different, it is considered that the Inspector took issue with the general impact of the proposal on the character of the area on the whole, not just from Green Drift. The following quotes from the Inspectors report are deemed relevant in this regard:

“This section of Heathfield is largely characterised by detached properties occupying relatively large plots with long rear gardens. I also observed during my site visit that the existing openness of the rear gardens on Heathfield combined with the existing trees and vegetation along the rear boundary with Green Drift, adds to the overall verdant quality of the area, adjacent to Green Drift.”

“Whilst the adjacent plot at No 40 Heathfield Road, has been subdivided with a dwelling built within its rear garden, I do not consider that this form of development is characteristic of the prevailing pattern of development in Heathfield”.

“I consider that this is not a generalised fear of precedent, but a realistic and specific concern, just as the appellants have cited the existence of the dwelling at No 40 Heathfield to support their scheme. Allowing this appeal would make it more difficult to resist further planning applications for similar developments, and I consider that their cumulative effect would exacerbate the harm to the character and appearance of the area”.

4.3.15 Taking the above considerations into account, the proposal would undoubtedly change the character of Green Drift which is currently a fence and a sky gap over the large rear garden of No.38 Heathfield. Whilst the proposal under this application looks to retain the landscaping on the rear boundary whilst including some additional planting to

effectively screen the development from Green Drift to a fair degree, even with landscaping you will still be able to see the dwelling from this side, as you can with the existing bungalow behind No.40.

4.3.16 In line with the above, it is noted that the Inspector did not consider that the existing dwelling to the rear of No.40 sets any sort of precedent and is uncharacteristic of the area. He considered that the character of Heathfield, with its large plots and rear gardens, adds to the verdant quality of the area. He further concludes that allowing development such as this would make future applications hard to resist and as a result, this would be harmful to the wider character and appearance of the area. This scheme is a back-land development which would erode the spacious, verdant character of the properties in this locality.

4.3.17 Furthermore, turning now to the recent appeal decision at the application site following the refusal of ref: 23/00830/FP, the Inspector also considered this matter of character and appearance in their report. The following quotes from the Inspectors report are deemed relevant in this regard:

“The proposed dwelling would be to the rear of the existing house which would screen much of the new building. There is a similar bungalow to the rear of the adjoining property, 40 Heathfield, which represents an oddity within this area, being the only perceptible development in-depth. That property is not prominent in the street scene but it is evident. The combination of the driveway to that property and the open driveway and parking area to the front of number 40 results in a greater prominence of development generally. The limited perception of the dwelling to the rear of number 40 is due in part to the landscaping within the front garden of the appeal property and along the side boundary between them”.

“Much has been made of the dormer bungalow to the rear of number 40 which was permitted in 1999. I do not have the details of the policies that were in place at that time but in any event, I must consider the current proposal on the basis of the current policies. That dwelling, although appearing at odds with the surroundings, currently has a relatively limited wider impact given the scale of development to the frontage plot and the retained landscaping, particularly within and adjacent to, the appeal property. Its presence does not suggest that similar developments would not erode the existing positive characteristics of the area”.

4.3.18 As such, whilst the Council acknowledge that the resubmission has gone some way to overcoming the Inspectors concerns insofar as it relates to landscaping (to be considered in more detail later on in this report), concerns remain that the proposed dwelling would increase the un-characteristic development in depth associated with the oddity at No.40 which is a clear anomaly to the positive prevailing character of the area. The Inspectors final sentence above is particularly relevant in this respect, which is a double negative that essentially states that the dwelling at No.40 does suggest that similar developments would erode the existing positive characteristics of the area.

4.3.19 The proposed development is therefore deemed contrary to Policy SP9 and D1 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 12 of the NPPF.

Layout and Design

4.3.20 Policy D1 of the Local Plan states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that respond positively to the sites local context and create or enhance the public realm. Policy SP9 of the Local Plan further considers that new

development will be supported where it is well designed and located and responds positively to its local context. This is echoed in Section 12 of the NPPF.

- 4.3.21 As considered under the previously refused application, the proposed dwelling has been sensitively and appropriately designed to reflect the design of other dwellings found in Heathfield. The dwelling would be of sympathetic form and proportions relative to the plot size and other properties within the immediate vicinity. The materials palette would also be unobjectionable.
- 4.3.22 As such, the proposed development is considered acceptable in layout and design, in accordance with Policies SP9 and D1 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Future Occupiers/Neighbours

- 4.3.23 Policy D3 of the Local Plan states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals which do not cause unacceptable harm to living conditions.
- 4.3.24 The proposed dwelling would exceed the nationally prescribed space standards for a 3bed/6person dwelling at 189sqm, ensuring a more than suitable standard of amenity for future occupiers. The property would benefit from decent sized rear private amenity space and all habitable rooms would benefit from high levels of natural light. Therefore, there are no objections to the impact of the proposal on the reasonable living conditions of future occupiers. This is in accordance with Policy D1 of the Local Plan.
- 4.3.25 The proposed dwelling is sited in the rear garden of the host dwelling which is bounded on either side with two other dwellings with similar sized rectangular plots, including the existing bungalow in the rear of No.40. The proposed dwelling is a bungalow with no side facing windows above ground level. It would be offset from the shared boundary with both neighbours which benefits from existing dense landscaping. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any material detrimental impacts upon the reasonable living conditions and well-being of neighbours, with respect to overdominance, overlooking/ loss of privacy, and loss of daylight/sunlight.

Highways, Access, and Parking

- 4.3.26 The Highway Authority raised no objection to the previous proposal under application ref: 23/00830/FP, seeing as Heathfield is a privately maintained road. Whilst they have not provided a formal comment on this application, the considerations and conclusions remain the same.
- 4.3.27 The proposed development would be facilitated by the removal of an existing garage, which would allow the existing access for No.38 to be extended past the host dwelling to the proposed plot. This would largely mirror the arrangement currently experienced at No.40, which is considered acceptable in planning terms.
- 4.3.28 The provision of 2NO parking spaces would be in accordance with the requirements set out under Policy T2 of the Local Plan.

Landscaping

- 4.3.29 Under the previously refused submission and dismissed appeal, the extent of landscaping details was fairly limited insofar as it relates to retained and new

landscaping. The Inspector made a number of important points in their report relating to landscaping, stating as follows:

“The planning statement suggests that there would be no loss of trees on site. It is evident that some trees have already been felled in the area of the proposed dwelling. A survey drawing or tree constraints/protection plan has not been provided. The Proposed Site Plan shows two different demarcations for trees but it is unclear what these different markings represent. The existing access passes between two substantial trees which allow for only its current very narrow width. The plan suggests that the access would be altered and moved to the west. It would appear therefore that at least one of these substantial trees would be lost. There is also a tree just in front of the house, to the side of the existing access, which is not shown on the plan. It would appear that this may also be lost to the new area for parking and turning”.

“No trees are shown for part of the length of the side boundary to the front of the existing house and no planting is proposed other than to the rear. Whilst some of the vegetation between these properties is situated alongside the adjacent driveway and some remains shown alongside the new driveway, it appears that significant amounts of vegetation would be lost. There is no clear information to demonstrate what is to be retained; whether the trees or large bushes could be retained without harm during construction; or whether they would survive with the revised layout”.

“The landscape setting of these properties is crucial with regard to maintaining the existing character of the area. From the information presented and my findings during my visit, it would appear likely that the frontage vegetation and the side vegetation would be significantly reduced, and the revised alignment of the access would prevent or restrict meaningful replacement planting. In the absence of clear evidence to the contrary in this regard, it is likely that the proposal would increase the prominence of the neighbouring rear property which is already out of character. It would also result in greater exposure of the dwelling proposed. This would consolidate the scale and prominence of development in-depth in this area. Even if it could be demonstrated that existing vegetation would be retained, the scale of the new parking area to the front of the existing property; the new driveway; and the combined driveways and parking areas of the two neighbours to the west, would result in a considerable expanse of surfacing with more limited planting, to the detriment of the general landscape setting. This represents poor design in this particular context”.

- 4.3.30 The applicant's interpretation of the appeal decision is that if a revised scheme addresses the hard surfacing, landscape and perception issues raised by the Inspector, then the objections raised could be overcome. This is the basis of this revised submission, which has included an Arboricultural Assessment and Landscape Masterplan. Following the completion of a tree survey and including the tree specialist in the design process, the proposed works are stated to not result in the loss of any existing trees on-site and will include increased planting on the rear boundary with Green Drift and the side boundary with No.40. The access to the site from Heathfield will instead be retained in its current position and the driveway to the rear of the property has been moved eastwards away from the existing boundary trees. This realignment of the driveway and retention of the access in its current position will also allow for an area for new landscaping at the front of the property. It will also ensure that

the proposed driveway at No.38 will be separated by the existing tree and new landscaping from the driveway that leads up to the existing dwelling to the rear of No.40. Lastly, the amount of hard surfacing shown on the proposed site plan has also been reduced. There is parking proposed at the front of the existing dwelling at No.38, but it is a reduced area of hardstanding providing space for two cars.

4.3.31 There are inconsistencies in the submitted plans requested to be considered to be approved. The AIA suggests all trees to be retained in their existing location bar T33, which would be re-located. The Detailed Planting Proposals drawing referenced 02 Rev A shows T33 in its existing location, and fails to show T43. The Landscape Master Plan then shows T43 in its existing location retained, and T33 in its existing location. Finally, and most concerning, the Proposed Site Plan (481.01 Rev C) indicated the removal of T33, T34 and T43, also showing T1 and T13 through a grey outline, which is unclear on its status within this proposed plan.

4.3.31 Due to inconsistent submission, it is not possible to conclude as to whether the concerns of the Inspector have been satisfactorily addressed insofar as it relates to the retention of existing landscaping on the frontage and side of the plot, the existing and new parking areas, and the new and combined driveway.

4.3.32 The landscaping as represented in some of the submitted details are welcome changes that may go towards addressing the Inspectors concerns relating to landscaping and hard surfacing, concerns remain over the perception of the proposed dwelling in this back land location. Whilst these retained trees on the frontage, alongside the host dwelling, will screen the development to a fair degree, the dwelling will still be visible from certain aspects which is detrimental to the wider character of the area. Furthermore, the insertion of additional landscaping on the rear boundary with Green Drift is noted as a means to screen the dwelling from view from this road, but landscaping should not be used to screen poor development and as already stated, even with the existing/proposed landscaping you will still see the dwelling from this Green Drift, as you can with the existing bungalow behind No.40.

Other Matters

4.3.33 The proposed site plan shows that the bins for this dwelling will be to the side of the proposed dwelling and would need to be wheeled up to Heathfield for collection. This is considered acceptable.

4.3.34 In terms of BNG, the North Herts Ecologist has formally responded to this application stating no objection subject to the inclusion of the BNG condition, which would include the purchase of off-site BNG units. This is in accordance with Policy NE4 of the Local Plan.

4.4 Conclusion

4.4.1 Overall, it is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling is located within the settlement of Royston, which is sustainable in accordance with Policy SP2 of the Local Plan. It is further considered that with respect to the economic, social, and environmental pillars of sustainability, the proposed development would see some modest benefits. The general layout and design of the proposal is sympathetic to the form, scale, and proportions of other residential properties on Heathfield, which would accord with

elements of Policies SP9 and D1 of the Local Plan in that respect. The scheme would provide future occupiers with an acceptable standard of amenity and would not result in material harm upon the reasonable living conditions of neighbours, in line with Policies D1 and D3 of the Local Plan in that respect. In terms of landscaping, notwithstanding the inconsistent submissions, the aims of the AIA to retain all existing landscape features would in-principal work towards overcoming the Inspectors concerns in this respect.

However, as covered within the previously refused scheme, there are material considerations that weigh against this proposal, namely the appeal decision at No.42 Heathfield (ref: APP/X1925/W/19/3231769), the appeal decision at the application site (ref: APP/X1925/W/23/3326023) and the prevailing character of the area. It is acknowledged by the LPA and the two Inspectors that the general character of properties on this part of Heathfield are detached dwellings benefitting from long, wide rear gardens that back onto Green Drift, with the property behind No.40 being the only anomaly to that prevailing character. In accordance with the Inspectors comments, the existing dwelling behind No.40 does not set any kind of precedent for similar development. Whilst there are specific differences between the application scheme and the appeal scheme at No.42, the Inspector dealing with the recent appeal at No.38 did have concerns that the proposed dwelling would increase the un-characteristic development in depth, which in the Councils view, would result in material harm to the spacious, verdant quality and character of the area. The proposed dwelling would remain perceptible behind the host dwelling and landscaping, as we can see with No.40 currently, which would be harmful to the character of the area. The proposal would not respond positively to the site's local context and is therefore deemed contrary to Policy SP9 and D1 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 12 of the NPPF.

Therefore, weighing up the aforementioned matters in the planning balance, it is acknowledged that the Inspector attributed considerable weight to the benefits associated by this proposal, namely the net gain of a single dwelling towards housing supply, the economic/social/environmental benefits, the acceptable design, parking, and amenity. The amendments to the scheme to overcome the landscaping concerns are noted and moderate weight is given to this matter. However, these benefits are not considered to outweigh the material harm to the positive character and appearance of the area, by virtue of the back-land nature of this proposal that does not respond well to the site's local context. It is therefore considered that planning permission should be refused.

4.5 **Alternative Options**

4.5.1 None.

4.6 **Pre-Commencement Conditions**

4.6.1 N/A.

5.0 **Recommendation**

5.1 That planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its back-land nature in the context of the prevailing pattern and character of development in Heathfield would result in material harm to the spacious, verdant quality and character of the area. The existing dwelling to the rear of No.40 does not set any kind of precedent in the locality and therefore, the scheme would not respond positively to the site's local context. The benefits associated with this proposal would not be outweighed by the harm identified. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies SP9 and D1 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 12 of the NPPF.

Proactive Statement:

Planning permission has been refused for this proposal for the clear reasons set out in this decision notice. The Council has not acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant as in the Council's view the proposal is unacceptable in principle and the fundamental objections cannot be overcome through dialogue. Since no solutions can be found the Council has complied with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Signed  Sam Dicocco	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Determining Officer Date: 15 August 2024	