

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Planning Committee

Tuesday, 7 March 2023 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

R D Burrett (Chair)

Y Khan (Vice-Chair)

Z Ali, K L Jaggard, K Khan, S Mullins, M Mwagale, S Pritchard, S Raja and S Sivarajah

Officers Present:

Valerie Cheesman

Principal Planning Officer

Siraj Choudhury

Head of Governance, People & Performance

Mez Matthews

Democratic Services Officer

Jean McPherson

Group Manager (Development Management)

Gill Narramore

Senior Environmental Health Officer

Clem Smith

Head of Economy and Planning

Also in Attendance:

Councillor T G Belben

Ward Councillor for Pound Hill North & Forge Wood

Councillor B J Burgess

Ward Councillor for Three Bridges

Councillor M Jones

Leader of the Council

Councillor R A Lanzer

Ward Councillor for Pound Hill South & Worth

Councillor K McCarthy

Ward Councillor for Pound Hill North & Forge Wood

Councillor J Millar-Smith

Ward Councillor for Maidenbower

Councillor A Nawaz

Ward Councillor for Three Bridges

Stephen Gee

Principal Planner (West Sussex County Council)

Guy Parfect

Senior Planner (West Sussex County Council)

Chris Pedlow

Democracy and Data Manager

1. Disclosures of Interest

The following disclosures of interests were made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Interest
Councillor Ali	Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – a West Sussex County Councillor.
Councillor Burrett	Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – a West Sussex County Councillor.
Councillor Burrett	Section 106 Monies – Q3 2022/23 (Minute 6)	Personal Interest – a West Sussex County Councillor.
Mez Matthews (Democratic Services Officer)	Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)	The Head of Governance, People & Performance (as Monitoring Officer) stated that, for openness and transparency, it should be noted that the Democratic Services Officer's husband had submitted a representation in regard to the application. As the Democratic Services Officer's role was neutral and as they were not a decision maker, the Monitoring Officer was happy for them to clerk and provide professional advice at the meeting.
<i>Councillor Lanzer (Non-Committee Member addressing the Committee)</i>	<i>Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)</i>	<i>Councillor Lanzer confirmed they were speaking as a Ward Councillor. For information, they declared they were a West Sussex County Councillor and also the Cabinet Representative on the Crawley Growth Programme. The planning application under consideration formed part of that Growth Programme.</i>

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Interest
Councillor Pritchard	Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL – Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 4)	Councillor Pritchard stated that their employer is Govia Thameslink Railway which serves as Operator for Three Bridges Station as well as for the rest of the Thameslink, Southern, Great Northern and Gatwick Express rail franchises in England. They stated this was not a personal or pecuniary interest because the company was significantly large in size and they were not a director or shareholder. Therefore, they confirmed they had no interest to declare which would prevent them from participating and voting on the application.

2. Lobbying Declarations

The following lobbying declarations were made by Councillors:

Councillors Ali, Burrett, Jaggard, K Khan, Y Khan, Mwagale, Pritchard, Raja and Sivarajah had been lobbied but had expressed no view on application CR/2022/0783/FUL.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 6 February 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Planning Application CR/2022/0783/FUL - Station Forecourt, Three Bridges Station, Haslett Avenue East, Three Bridges, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/411a](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Improvement works to railway station forecourt, including rationalisation of bus facilities with area for bus hub, car, cycle and motorcycle parking, taxi rank, and drop off/pick up areas; highway alterations; and the provision of public (pedestrian/cycle) access to eastern side of station from Station Hill including cycle parking, ticket machine and entrance building and revised depot and signal staff parking.

Councillors Ali, Burrett, Jaggard, K Khan, Mullins, Mwagale, Pritchard, Raja and Sivarajah declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer provided a verbal summation of the application, which sought permission for improvement works to the railway station forecourt to promote sustainable forms of travel and to improve accessibility to the transport interchange. The works included the creation of new, enlarged and better quality public space

across the whole of the site frontage along Haslett Avenue East; the rationalisation of the bus facilities with an area for a bus hub; car, cycle and motorcycle parking, taxi rank, and drop off/pick up areas; highway alterations; and the provision of public (pedestrian/cycle) access to the eastern side of the station from Station Hill including cycle parking, a ticket machine and an entrance building, with revised depot and signal staff parking facilities; and space available for public art.

The Officer updated the Committee that, since the publication of the report, the Environment Agency had requested several additional conditions relating to ground water and prevention of its contamination. The Environment Agency had also requested several additional informatives which related to the new conditions and information on which those conditions were based. Those new conditions and informatives concerned:

- A Contamination Strategy.
- A verification report demonstrating completion of works identified in the Remediation Strategy.
- A Remediation Strategy for any potential previously unidentified contamination.
- Surface water drainage.

In addition to the new conditions requested by the Environment Agency, the Principal Planning Officer had incorporated an additional informative regarding ongoing discussions with the station operators to explore alternative positions for the loading bay and had amended current Condition 4 as follows to clarify the position of the protective fences for trees:

Amended Condition 4:

“No development or site works of any description, including setting up works or storage of materials, plant or equipment, shall take place on the part of the application site that is on the eastern side of the railway unless and until all the existing trees/bushes/hedges to be retained on the site have been protected with fences in accordance with the details set out in the Arboricultural Report and the Tree Protection Plan. The protective fencing shall remain in position for the duration of the works. Within the areas so fenced off, the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. If any trenches for services are required in the fenced off areas, they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 25 mm or more shall be left unsevered.

REASON: To ensure the retention and maintenance of trees and vegetation which is an important feature of the area in accordance with Policies CH3 and CH6 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 - 2030.

REASON FOR PRE-COMMENCEMENT CONDITION: Potential damage to trees could occur from site activity before development commences and therefore the agreed measures need to be in place before commencement of development.”

The report advised that, at the time of its publication, an Emissions Mitigation Assessment had not been completed. The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that the Assessment had now been provided and concluded that the value of the emissions cost would be £8,063. That money would be put towards one of the cycle routes identified in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (namely Route C and/or D). That money would be secured via a Section 106 Legal Agreement along with the Section 106 monies for replacement trees and a Traffic Regulation Order.

The Principal Planning Officer proposed the recommendation be revised to delegate the decision to permit to the Head of Economy and Planning to allow for the conclusion of the Section 106 Legal Agreement and then to subsequently grant permission subject to the updated conditions and informatives.

The Principal Planning Officer then gave details of the various relevant planning considerations as set out in the report and reiterated that the aim of the scheme was to improve sustainable travel options and improve the public realm. The Officer advised it had not been possible to accommodate all requests made by stakeholders in their entirety which would be at the expense of other aspects of the scheme. The Committee was advised that officers from West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) and Crawley Borough Council's Senior Environmental Health Officer were in attendance to assist in answering any questions from the Committee.

Paul Sharp, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. Matters raised included:

- Road congestion due to the closing of one of the existing lanes could cause exits and accesses to be blocked, which may cause more accidents.
- Concern relating to the assumptions made during traffic modelling. Mr Sharp highlighted particular concern with regard to traffic levels potentially increasing along Chaucer Road and Grattons Drive.
- Increased activity in the area may cause the air quality to deteriorate.
- Pedestrians using the eastbound bus stop would be required to cross two-way traffic from the station, which seemed dangerous.

Collins Nyamupfukudza, Manager of Charlie's Refreshments and Snack Bar, spoke in relation to the application. Matters raised included:

- The snack bar was situated in the station car park, and currently did not have an allocated parking bay for the pick-up or drop-off of goods.
- An allocated parking bay would allow staff to access the snack bar without causing disruption to other users of the car park or being issued with a parking ticket.
- The business was prepared to cover any associated costs.

Derek Kiernan, representing the Crawley Hackney Carriage Association, spoke in objection to the application. Matters raised included:

- Not allowing a right turn out of the station would negatively impact the taxi trade as it would increase journey times and prices.
- It was not practical for taxi drivers to travel to the Paymaster General's Roundabout and back to the station in order to travel eastbound.
- Moving the taxi rank was unnecessary and could lead to increased fees for taxi drivers if it were moved onto land owned by the railway operator.

Peter Rainier, the agent (on behalf of the applicant), spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- The Crawley Growth Programme set out that improvements to the station were necessary in order to meet the town's needs, and the proposed application met those requirements.
- The proposals provided improved bus facilities and access for cyclists and pedestrians, as well as visual improvements to the front of the station.
- West Sussex County Council had concluded that the proposed road system and traffic flow fulfilled its requirements, and that there were no viable alternatives which would improve the station for all users.

John Cooban, a local resident, spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- There were issues with the vehicular eastern access, but the scheme did provide substantial benefits to pedestrians and cyclists as well as public realm improvements.
- The improved urban tree cover in a currently unattractive area was a positive, e.g. along the west side of the station. Some of the proposed new trees, however, may encounter hostile planting/rooting environments, and therefore remediation groundworks were recommended to ensure healthy tree growth.
- The proposed markings on the pedestrian/cycle paths would improve safety.

Gordon Easden, representing Crawley Walking and Cycling Forum, spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- The current station layout (platforms, footpaths, and forecourt) was problematic and dangerous for many station users.
- The proposed scheme offered safer access for pedestrians and cyclists, improved westbound traffic flow, reduced carbon emissions, an improved bus interchange and better impression of Crawley.
- A minority of station users may be disadvantaged by changes to the eastbound access but overall, the new scheme provided improvements.

Councillor Atif Nawaz, Ward Councillor for Three Bridges, spoke in support of the application. Councillor Nawaz confirmed that, although Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development, they were speaking in their capacity as Ward Councillor. Matters raised included:

- The current design of the station was unwelcoming and unsafe; the new scheme would create a better first impression of the town and benefit Three Bridges residents.
- The pavement under the railway bridge was currently not disability accessible and needed to be made wider and safer.
- The application supported improved access to the station by sustainable transport (e.g. via the bus hub), which would help contribute to the goal of net zero carbon emissions.

Councillor Brenda Burgess, Ward Councillor for Three Bridges, spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- Currently the station was unattractive and not fit for purpose, including the vehicular access.
- Removing one lane of traffic may help contribute to better air quality and lower pollution in the area, which would benefit all residents, including children.
- The traffic modelling showed that traffic flow around the station would be improved.

Councillor Bob Lanzer, Ward Councillor for Pound Hill South & Worth, spoke in support of the application. Matters raised included:

- The application was a result of years of consultation and offered significant improvements, including pedestrian, cycle, and bus accesses and better air quality.
- The reduction of three lanes of traffic to two and in turn the removal of the eastbound right-hand turn was not uncommon, as many dual carriageways only allowed exit via a left-hand turn.
- Reliable computer-assisted traffic modelling had been undertaken which demonstrated that a very small percentage of all traffic movements from the station were right-hand turns which utilised the eastbound access. The proposed scheme was therefore beneficial to the majority of station users.

Councillor Jennifer Millar-Smith, Ward Councillor for Maidenbower, spoke in objection to the application. Matters raised included:

- Maidenbower currently experienced significant traffic travelling west - removing a lane may further increase this traffic and in turn increase travel costs and air pollution.
- The removal of the right-hand turn would cause road users travelling eastbound to either extend their journey time by an estimated 5-6 minutes, or encourage an increase in illegal manoeuvres on Station Hill when dropping off station users.
- There were long-term issues with flooding under the railway bridge, which were likely to be exacerbated if the application was approved.

Councillor Kevan McCarthy, Ward Councillor for Pound Hill North & Forge Wood, spoke in objection to the application. Matters raised included:

- It was important to ensure that all station users benefitted from a new scheme; however, the loss of the right-hand turn was problematic for those living east of the station.
- This change was also likely to negatively impact the taxi trade. Currently around 80% of Hackney Carriage hires in Crawley were from Three Bridges Station, with all of those journeys travelling either east or west. The proposals would allow left-hand turns only, so travelling eastbound may greatly increase journey time and hire cost for the travelling public, as well as pollution.
- The right turn into Hazelwick Avenue could be utilised as an exit from the station which would alleviate the eastbound traffic flow.

Councillor Tina Belben, Ward Councillor for Pound Hill North & Forge Wood, spoke in objection to the application. Matters raised included:

- The traffic modelling described in the report was undertaken at off-peak times - modelling carried out by Ward Councillors during peak times showed a greater number of right-hand turns than calculated by WSCC.
- The lack of a right-hand turn and the removal of one lane along Haslett Avenue East would increase traffic which may extend backwards to the Paymaster General's Roundabout, which would increase journey times for all road users in the area.
- The report did not refer to the potential knock-on effect of increased parking on nearby residential roads.

The Committee then considered the application. Following queries from the Committee, the following clarification was provided:

- It would be possible to monitor the air quality along Billinton Drive once the development had been completed.
- Staffing and hours of opening of the eastern entrance was a matter for the station operator and was not a planning consideration. The issue would be discussed with the station operator should planning permission be granted.
- The structural stability of the retaining wall along Station Hill, following the removal of the tress was not a planning matter, but was a structural issue for the landowner and Building Regulations.
- The application proposed that a loading bay be located in front of the station and pedestrian area, although discussion was underway to explore a potential alternative location, such as to the side of the building in Williams Way.
- It was normal procedure to delegate a decision to permit to the Head of Economy and Planning when permission was subject to completion of a S106 Legal Agreement.
- The taxi rank at Three Bridges Station was currently located on land owned by WSCC Highways, however the application proposed that the taxi rank be re-located to land owned by the railway operator. The landownership

arrangements, and the possibility of the new taxi rank land being transferred to WSCC Highways, were to be discussed between the parties.

- The replacement parking bays being provided at the proposed eastern entrance to the station would be for use by depot staff and would not be for public use.
- The data collected and published by the Police relating to accidents in the station vicinity were correct, although it was likely that some accidents went unreported.
- Traffic modelling did not assess all possible alternative routes for travelling eastwards, but it had shown that some people's journey times would be increased. It was noted however that updated travel surveys showed there had been a decrease in traffic numbers across the network since Covid.

The Committee debated the application at length and agreed that improvements to the station forecourt were overdue with it being well used as the main station for Crawley having direct mainlines to London, Brighton and Arun Valley. It was acknowledged that improvements to the forecourt would not only benefit station users but also those travelling towards the Town Centre. There was a consensus that the current layout, whilst dangerous for all road users, was especially dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.

Several Committee members argued however that, although the proposal held a lot of merit and there was an obvious need to upgrade the forecourt area of Three Bridges Station, some residents in Crawley would be adversely affected by some elements of the application.

Those Committee members held the opinion that the loss of the right-hand turn would negatively affect residents living to the east of the station, as using an alternative route would increase journey times, fuel and taxi fare costs as well as pollution and congestion. Particular concern was expressed that many drivers would choose to travel along the smaller residential roads within the area, rather than using the main roads and it was felt that would increase risks to local residents. In addition, those who objected strongly to the loss of the right-hand turn were of the view that traversing Haslett Avenue East towards Hazelwick Avenue (rather than turning around at the Paymaster General's Roundabout) would be dangerous, and cause disruption to the flow of traffic along Haslett Avenue East.

Support was expressed for the proposed eastern entrance to the station, although many Committee members were disappointed that it was not served by a drop-off zone for passengers. It was also argued that no traffic modelling had been undertaken on the impact a lack of a drop-off zone could have on creating potential delays, congestion or blockages to traffic and the lack of a drop-off zone could lead to dangerous manoeuvres along Station Hill and/or its junction with Worth Park Avenue / Haslett Avenue East. Additionally, it was argued that the loss of the right-hand turn from the station was likely to encourage passenger drop-offs at the new eastern entrance with vehicles then travelling through the residential roads of Maidenbower, inevitably increasing pollution and congestion in the area and impacting air quality.

Other concerns raised included the ability for station users with limited mobility to be dropped off / picked up outside the station and then turn right, the lack of a drop-off area when a rail replacement service was provided by buses and the impact the reduction in the number of lanes under the bridge would have on congestion, pollution and the ease at which vehicles could exit Maidenbower from Station Hill.

Several other Committee members were in support of the proposal and were especially pleased that several pavements would be widened as part of the scheme, particularly as the pavement under the bridge was currently dangerously narrow and

held the risk of pedestrians being clipped by the wing mirrors of larger vehicles. The widening of the pavement serving the westbound bus stop was also supported as its current width increased risks for those waiting at the bus stop and pedestrians generally. Several members of the Committee hoped that the removal of one lane under the bridge would ease the noise level for pedestrians and cyclists as the current level created an additional risk by causing a loss in focus.

Overall, the majority of the Committee felt that the benefits of the scheme outweighed its negative aspects. Whilst it was established that retaining the right-hand turn would have been preferable, most Committee members appreciated that the decision to remove it had not been taken lightly and it would not have been possible to provide the level of improvement to the forecourt had it been retained.

At the request of Councillor Jaggard, and in accordance with General Committee Procedure Rule 13.4, the names of the Councillors voting for and against the officer recommendation were recorded as follows:

For the recommendation to permit:

Councillors K Khan, Y Khan, Mullins, Pritchard, Raja and Sivarajah (6).

Against the recommendation to permit:

Councillors Ali, Burrett, Jaggard and Mwagale (4).

Abstentions: (0).

With the vote being 6 for the recommendation to permit and 4 against the recommendation to permit, the proposal was therefore CARRIED, and it was

RESOLVED

That the decision to PERMIT be delegated to the Head of Economy and Planning, subject to the conclusion of the Section 106 Legal Agreement, and subject to the conditions set out in report PES/411a, amended Condition 4 (as identified above) and the following additional four conditions and three informatives renumbered as follows:

New Condition 9:

“No development approved by this planning permission shall commence until a strategy to deal with the potential risks associated with any contamination of the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

This strategy will include the following components:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
 - all previous uses;
 - potential contaminants associated with those uses;
 - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and
 - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.
2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any

changes to these components require the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

REASON: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy ENV10 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

REASON FOR PRE-COMMENCEMENT CONDITION: This condition is required to be pre-commencement to safeguard the health of construction workers and prevent any contamination on the site impacting into the surrounding area. The risks for neighbours, site workers and future residents and users of the site must be appropriately mitigated.”

New Condition 10:

“Prior to any part of the development hereby permitted being brought into use, a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

REASON: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to human health or the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete. This is in line with Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.”

New Condition 11:

“If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

REASON: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site in line with Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.”

New Condition 12:

“No drainage systems infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution caused by mobilised contaminants in line with Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions 9-14, as set out in report PES/411a, have thus been renumbered to be Conditions 13-18.

New Informative 5:

“The Environment Agency advises that in relation to Condition 9:

A Preliminary Risk Assessment (Phlorum, ref 11754 Rev0, November 2022) has been submitted in support of this application and it is felt that it has been carried out in accordance with relevant guidance. The PRA therefore satisfies Part 1 of the above condition. The PRA has recommended that further site investigation should

be carried out (Part 2 of the above condition), which the EA is in agreement with. The EA now looks forward to receiving and providing comment on this submitted site investigation.”

New Informative 6:

“The Environment Agency advises that:

Only clean uncontaminated water should drain to the surface water system. Roof drainage shall drain directly to the surface water system (entering after the pollution prevention measures).

Appropriate pollution control methods (such as trapped gullies and interceptors) should be used for drainage from access roads and car parking areas to prevent hydrocarbons from entering the surface water system.

There should be no discharge into land impacted by contamination or land previously identified as being contaminated. There should be no discharge to made ground. There must be no direct discharge to groundwater, a controlled water.”

New Informative 7:

“The Environment Agency advises that in regard to the disposal of materials: Contaminated soil that is, or must be disposed of, is waste. Therefore, its handling, transport, treatment and disposal is subject to waste management legislation, which includes:

- Duty of Care Regulations 1991
- Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005
- Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010
- The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011

Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically in line with British Standard BS EN 14899:2005 'Characterization of Waste - Sampling of Waste Materials - Framework for the Preparation and Application of a Sampling Plan' and that the permitting status of any proposed treatment or disposal activity is clear. If in doubt, we should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays.

If the total quantity of waste material to be produced at or taken off site is hazardous waste and is 500kg or greater in any 12 month period the developer will need to register with us as a hazardous waste producer.”

Original Informative 5 is renumbered to be Informative 8.

New Informative 9:

“The applicant is advised to continue discussions with the station operators to explore alternative positions for the loading bay, with the aim of it being relocated from the front of the proposed pedestrianised forecourt area. Locations to the rear/side of the station building would be preferred.”

5. Objections to the Crawley Borough Council Tree Preservation Order - St Joan Close No. 1 - 04/2022

The Committee considered report [PES/429](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which sought to determine whether to confirm the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) – St Joan Close No. 1 – 04/2022 – with or without modification for continued protection, or not to confirm the TPO.

Councillor Burrett declared they had visited the site.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application, which related to two trees in residential gardens in Langley Green. In October 2022 the trees were protected under a six month provisional TPO, which the

Committee was now requested to confirm. Objections had been received from local residents regarding the protection of one of the trees in particular.

Ian Chandler, the owner of a neighbouring property to the site of the trees, spoke on behalf of all the objectors to the TPO. Several photos submitted by Mr Chandler were displayed during their presentation. Matters raised, particularly in respect of the larger tree, included:

- They did not wish to fell the tree but wanted to trim and tidy it.
- The tree was unruly, dropped sticky residue on the garden and provided an excessive amount of shade to the garden which stopped grass from growing.
- The tree provided limited amenity value as it was not visible from the street.

The Committee then considered the application. Whilst it appreciated the matters raised by Mr Chandler, it held the opinion that a TPO did not prevent works from being undertaken and the trees were worthy of protection. The Committee therefore unanimously agreed that the TPO should be confirmed without modification.

RESOLVED

That the Tree Preservation Order - St Joan Close No. 1 - 04/2022 be CONFIRMED without modification.

6. Section 106 Monies - Q3 2022/23

The Committee considered report [PES/428](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning.

The report summarised all the Section 106 (S106) monies received, spent and committed to project schemes in Quarter 3 of the financial year 2022/23.

RESOLVED

That the update on S106 monies received, spent and committed in Quarter 3 of the financial year 2022/23 was noted.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Planning Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 10.37 pm.

R D Burrett (Chair)