Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the Your contact: Peter Mannings

Development Management Extn: 2174

Committee Date: 8 December 2016

cc. All other recipients of the Development Management Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2016

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 and Unauthorised Development for Consideration by the Committee (Pages 3 – 8)

Yours faithfully,

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

MEETING: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

VENUE: COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD

DATE: WEDNESDAY 7 DECEMBER 2016

TIME : 7.00 PM



East Herts Council: Development Management Committee Date: 7 December 2016

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 – 3/16/2072/FUL – The Causeway, Bishop's Stortford	Further correspondence had been received, setting out neutral observations, from the third party whose comments are set out in the report commenting further on surface water drainage considerations.	The Lead Local Flood Authority has confirmed that they do not wish to comment on the application. It is acknowledged that the NPPF states that priority should be given to sustainable drainage systems, and a car park surface has the potential to have a greater impact on pollution over a commercial roof. However there is an existing surface water drainage system provided within the site (which does currently include car parking) and the use of the site is proposed to be for a temporary period. Any future redevelopment of the site will need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems. There it is considered that a condition in this case requiring further information on surface water drainage is not required.
5b – 3/16/1251/REM – Land between Farnham Road		Errors in the report at paragraphs 1.2 and 3.2 – these paragraphs should read as follows:- Paragraph 1.2 Outline permission has been granted for the proposals

and Haze
Road,
Bishop's
Stortford

and it is necessary now to test the detailed proposals coming forward against the aspirations and objectives established at the outline permission stage and in light of the relevant policies. In that respect, relevant issues related to the quality of the open space that will be achieved and how the impact of the residential development in due course will be moderated by the landscaping proposals; how the site will operate in transport terms and how the proposed road configuration will address the policy objectives which seek to enable transport modes other than by private vehicle.

Paragraph 3.2

Outline planning permission has been granted for development at ARS5 for Countryside Properties under LPA reference 3/13/0886/0P. All matters were reserved as part of that outline planning application except for access. Planning permission was granted by the Council on 12 October 2016 (LPA reference 3/16/1952/FUL) for some changes to the access arrangements.

Paragraph 10.21 of the Committee Report states that Members will be updated on the lasted position in respect of the future maintenance and adoption of the main spine road which runs through the site. The update is as follows:

Option 1) in paragraph 10.19 of the report is not being pursued by the applicant as the Highway Authority does

	_	τ
	2	ט
(2	2
	(D
	C	5

DM Committee: 7 December 2016

		not prefer this approach. The applicant is however pursing option 2) in paragraph 10.19 of the report and is awaiting clarification from the Highway Authority of a commuted sum payment that would be required. Option 3 also remains as an option under consideration
	The Councils Engineering Advisor has reviewed the additional drainage information submitted and comments that the drainage as proposed provides predominantly good quality green infrastructure that additionally creates amenity and biodiversity areas particularly for the new SuDS ponds and the re-use, protection and enhancement of existing open channels.	Members will note in para 6.4 and 10.12 of the Committee Report that the Engineering Advisor had commented that it would be helpful for further information to be submitted regarding the connection of surface water drainage systems through the site. Such information has been submitted by the applicant and this is considered to provide good quality sustainable drainage systems in accordance with policy ENV21 of the Local Plan and emerging policy WAT5.
5d 3/16/0452/FUL Rye Street, Farnham Road, Bishop's Stortford	Herts Police Crime Prevention Advisor comments that Secured by Design can be achieved at the site.	Noted – the development will therefore comply with policy ENV3 of the Local Plan and DES4 of the emerging Plan.
5e – 3/16/1391/FUL – Land at Park Farm	EHDC Housing Development and Strategy Manager has commented that 40% affordable housing should be sought across the two sites. There are around 190 people on the Housing Needs Register who have over	Comments noted

Industrial Estate, Buntingford

75 points and have indicated an interest in the Buntingford location. The predominant need is for 1, 2 and 3 bed units and therefore the proposal should provide some 3 bedroom properties. The Affordable housing tenures should be affordable rent and shared ownership, 75% for rent and 25% for shared ownership.

Herts Police Crime Prevention Advisor has commented on concerns with possible antisocial behaviour below the flats over garages and recommends that the entrances are gated and under croft parking areas lit. Comments have also been made that to comply with Secured by Design all individual entrance doors and external doors must be third party certified to PAS 24.

EHDC Conservation and Heritage Advisor has commented that the proposal is of an excessive density with small gardens, tight spaces between buildings and close to site boundaries, which is unnecessary on this edge of town site and does not relate well to its context. The proposal is of poor design and fails to provide physical links that would enhance permeability. The loss of the site to wholly residential should be resisted, as the need for employment land is likely to increase and the existing Industrial Estate would not prove to be a good neighbour to residential units.

Comments noted

Comments noted

Page 7

5f – 3/15/0260/FUL – Well House, Acorn Street, Hunsdon

HCC Development Services provide amended comments and seek the following financial contributions:-

Primary education (towards the expansion of Hunsdon JMI school) - £32,966;

Library services (towards the enhancement of the children's area at Sawbridgeworth library) - £2,350; Youth services (towards the new MUGA/sports provision for Ware Young People Project) - £716

Members will have been circulated with a summary of points that the public speaker in objection is going to set out at the meeting and raising concern in relation to the impact of the proposals on designated heritage assets and the sustainability of development.

The EHDC Conservation and Urban Design Advisor has assessed the proposals further in respect of this matter and is of the view that the proposals do not harm the setting of the nearby designated heritage assets. It is noted that the Grade 1 Hunsdon house lies around 0.7km to the south of the site. The present on site buildings are considered harmful to the setting of the listed buildings and the proposed development, including the current and proposed

The previous comments from HCC Development Services which are summarised in the committee report included contributions towards library services and youth services and they are included in the recommended heads of terms in the Committee Report.

The financial contribution relating to the primary school is considered to be necessary and reasonable and based on the pressures that the development will have on existing primary school provision. This contribution is therefore considered to meet the tests set out in S122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL) 2010 and will be included with those to be sought as part of the legal agreement.

The points to be raised by the speaker are noted. The proposals are considered to be acceptable with regard to the impact on heritage assets. With regard to the sustainability point, whilst noted, the Councils policies do not seek to apply a maximum to the development which could take place outside of urban settlements.

	landscaping will improve the setting of the heritage assets and the longer distance views in the area.	
5h, 3/16/1576/VAR Hoggates End, Dane O'Coys Road, Bishop's Stortford	The applicant notes a mistake in the description of development – indicating that the proposals include 9 units of affordable housing, not 9 shared ownership units The HCC Archaeology advisor indicates that they have no further comments to make in relation to amended plans	The applicant correctly identifies the mistake