Delegation Panel meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 19 August 2025
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Smart (Chair of Planning Committee), Michael Hammond (substituting for Toby Williams), Amy Stocks (case officer) and Cllr Gawthrope Wood (King Hedges Cllr)

Apologies: None received.

Minutes approved by date: 26 August 25

1	**25/00174/FUL – 80-82 Lovell Road Kings Hedges** Erection of self-build dwelling, alterations to existing access and alterations to 80 and 82 Lovell Road **Reason for Inclusion:** Number of objections **Key considerations:** 5 or more objections **Discussion** The case officer presented the application. Cllr Gawthrope Wood explained to the panel why they considered it was necessary for the application to be determined at Planning Committee. This was due to concerns with parking, overshadowing, size/ scale, effect on no.80 – 82 Lovell Road locality of occupiers and discrepancy between local objectors and those supporters not being local. Concerns were also raised about lack of knowledge and time for the delegation panel to process. Policy 52 (garden land) was considered to be relevant to this application and it was acknowledged by the panel that this policy had not been tested on this side and section of Lovell Road. This may therefore raise implications that require important matters of judgement on the implementation of adopted policy that would be of wider significance to the Development Plan. The application nature, scale and complexity was considered to warrant Committee consideration, again, given the lack of similar development in this part of Lovell Road and the material planning considerations that were raised by third parties. An awareness of planning history in the wider area of other backland developments was raised in discussion but this alone would not be of wider public interest that the application be presented to planning committee. The case officer identified that there were a total of 42 representations in objection and 10 representations in support of the application. Material planning considerations were identified in these comments. As such, it was considered that the degree of	AS

	public involvement in either scenario of approval or refusal meant that it was necessary for this application to be discussed at planning committee. Overall, the application does give rise significant issues of material consideration, policy implementation / interpretation, complexity or nature or through its planning history to merit Planning Committee consideration. A significant amount of public involvement was evident too Consequently, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the acting Delivery Manager considered the proposal should be referred to the planning committee. **Decision: Refer to Planning Committee**	