

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Tel: 01279 502174
Date: 3 February 2021

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 3 FEBRUARY 2021

Please find attached the Additional Representations Summary as circulated by the Head of Planning and Building Control prior to the meeting in respect of the following:

5. Planning Applications for Consideration by the Committee
(Pages 3 - 12)

Yours faithfully,

Peter Mannings
Democratic Services Officer
East Herts Council
peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk

MEETING : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
VENUE : ONLINE MEETING - LIVESTREAMED
DATE : WEDNESDAY 3 FEBRUARY 2021
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 3rd February 2021

Summary of additional representations received after completion of reports submitted to the committee, but received by 5pm on the date of the meeting.

Agenda No	Summary of representations	Officer comments
5a	Following discussions with the applicant a financial contribution of £20,000 has been secured towards the implementation of a Residents Parking Zone on Tamworth Road and its nearby vicinity.	<p>The financial contribution has been secured in response to the parking concerns raised and will be included within the Section 106 agreement.</p> <p>As the implementation of Residents Parking Zones operate outside of the planning system and requires a formal public consultation with residents and businesses, living in close proximity to the primary location. The implementation of such a scheme is not certain until this exercise has been undertaken. Discussions with the Council's</p>

		parking team consider this contribution amount to be appropriate, as the outcome of any initial consultation may lead to the development of a larger scheme in order to cope with local demands.
	The total affordable housing commuted sum has been increased from £142,860 (stated in the report) to £343,539.	Due to a calculation error by Hertfordshire County Council, the financial contributions associated with education have reduced overall. As these larger amounts had been included within the viability appraisal, that money can viably be allocated towards affordable housing provision in the District without affecting the viability of the scheme.
	Prior to committee a question was raised by a Councillor wanting to understand the circumstances of the viability assessment and why the desired 40% affordable housing at the site cannot be achieved when compared to other proposals which have fulfilled the	<p>The following response has been issued to address the question raised.</p> <p>The proposed scheme produces a favourable level of residual land value, when compared to other recently reviewed viability assessments.</p>

	<p>requirement both greenfield and brownfield (HERT2).In addition how is the site evaluated when the site is already owned and there are no costs involved.</p>	<p>However, the viability profile of the site is driven by the fact that the existing site includes over 60,000 ft2 of existing floor area. When one applies a relatively modest rental value to this existing floor area, the scheme derives a relatively high Existing Use Value. National guidance recommends that viability assessments measure the uplift in land value, comparing the planning application scheme to this Existing Use Value (plus premium). Unfortunately, the value derived from the proposed 49 unit scheme isn't sufficiently high, in order to produce a significant uplift in land value. The planning application scheme also includes substantial costs related to demolition, site clearance, site remediation and asbestos removal. These costs further limit the level of developer surplus which the proposed development can achieve.</p> <p>I note your query in relation to the fact that the</p>
--	---	--

		<p>owner doesn't need to purchase the land, however in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance on viability, it is well established that viability does not take into account personal circumstances as it is an objective assessment of the site at a current point in time. The existing land use values are what matters in this instance.</p> <p>I note the points you raise in relation to Bircherley Green and HERT2, however Bircherley Green did not allow for any affordable housing and the HERT2 site was deemed unviable however the developer offered a percentage of affordable housing (15%) 'to respond positively to the newly adopted District Plan'. As both of these schemes were unviable the Council are unable to request any affordable homes unless the applicant is willing to offer a proportion. Unlike greenfield sites, which generally in my</p>
--	--	--

		<p>experience are able to achieve 40% affordable housing, brownfield sites have more constraints that are required to be considered when undertaking viability assessments.</p> <p>I would also mention that the Bircherley Green, HERT2 and Tamworth Road viability assessments have all been undertaken by the same independent viability consultant on behalf of the Council, therefore they are aware of circumstances in the town and area more generally.</p>
	<p>Tamworth Road Neighbourhood Association have provided comments in response to the committee report.</p> <p>The comments seek to address layout, design, appearance and residential amenity in relation to District Plan policies DES1, DES3,</p>	<p>The Officer report justifies the development and many of the queries have been raised during the course of the application and have been addressed within the committee report.</p>

	<p>DES4 and the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPF).</p>	
	<p>Tamworth Road Neighbourhood Association.</p> <p>This document compares the Mangrove Road development and the Tamworth Road development.</p> <p>20 comparison points are noted and include the following topics:</p> <p>Design and layout, impact on the conservation area, density of the development, masterplanning, landscaping, equipped play areas, parking layout and type of parking provision (garages etc), affordable housing, accessible and adaptable dwellings, flood risk, use of air source heat pumps vs gas boilers, preparation of Masterplan Framework ,</p>	<p>The document compares the proposed development at the Hertford Mill site to development on Mangrove Road (HERT5). Whilst comparisons can be drawn, these are two different sites, with different considerations and are therefore not directly comparable.</p>
	<p>Tamworth Road Neighbourhood Association.</p>	<p>The objections raised within this letter have been included within the neighbour</p>

	<p>A further document has been received reiterating the objections made by the Tamworth Road Neighbourhood Association dated 17 June 2020.</p>	<p>representations section of the report and repeat objections raised by other residents.</p>
	<p>Comments have been received from a resident, commenting on the committee report and highlighting objections. Many of the comments have already been raised within the 'representations' section of the committee report. However a summary of the objections raised within this document include:</p> <p>Concerns regarding conservation advice of the granary and the retention of the Chapel Mill.</p> <p>Levels of affordable housing and if there is a gainshare clause where the council will be provided with additional houses if affordability alters during construction.</p>	<p>Many of these comments have already been raised and are included within the committee report and addressed within the Officer report.</p> <p>In relation to the concern regarding a covenant on the title deeds, this is a civil matter and is not a material planning consideration.</p>

	<p>Devaluation of house prices on Tamworth Road.</p> <p>The use of materials and the types and colour of brick stocks to be used. The beige bricks are not found anywhere in the existing industrial buildings nor on Tamworth Road nor on any of the developments off Tamworth Road.</p> <p>Heights of the three storey buildings, loss of light and cause overlooking. Loss of parking spaces on Tamworth Road and traffic implications of the development.</p> <p>Loss of employment site and marketing of the site.</p> <p>Covenant on the title deeds for property stipulates that the site should not cause</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>issues to other inhabitants of the road.</p>	
	<p>The applicant has today provided comments in response to the neighbour objections submitted during the course of the application and has reference where these points are covered within the Officer report.</p>	<p>The neighbour objections are set out in the Officer report and are addressed in the consideration of the application.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank