Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the Your contact: Peter Mannings

Development Management Extn: 2174

Committee Date: 10 November 2016

cc. All other recipients of the Development Management Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 9 NOVEMBER 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 9 NOVEMBER 2016

TIME : 7.00 PM



East Herts Council: Development Management Committee Date: 09 November 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
3/16/1918/REM – Land east of Cambridge Road, Puckeridge	Additional comments have been received from Standon Parish Council raising concern that the development does not conform to a linear form of development with dwellings facing Cambridge Road which is set out in the Standon Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan.	The comments made are noted – however, for the reasons set out in the report and having regard to the Planning Inspectors comments in relation to the refused outline planning application, the development proposal is considered to provide an appropriate layout and relationship with Cambridge Road. The Neighbourhood Plan is not at a stage where significant weight can be attached to it and it would not, in any event, outweigh the acceptability of the layout and design as set out in the Officer report.
3/16/1716/FUL – Land West of Sele Farm estate, Hertford	The Council's Leisure Services Manager has recently commented on the proposals and considers that:- In terms of the need for swimming pool provision in the District, East Hertfordshire residents enjoy high levels of supply when compared to the demand they generate discreetly as a population. The area has nine 25m pools	These factors serve to temper the weight that can be attributed to the positive benefits of the proposal and supports the recommendation as set out in the report.

of varying size which is positive although a key issue with the overall pool stock is that it is ageing. The levels of unmet demand are very low at just 290 Visits Per Week during Peak Periods. This suggests that there is currently no unmet demand for swimming. This does not mean that there is no market for the type of operation proposed but it would be unlikely to have a significant impact upon the levels of physical activity across the district.

As regards the provision of tennis facilities, consultation with both indoor tennis facility providers in neighbouring areas indicates that there is spare capacity at both facilities at present, equivalent to 0.25 of an indoor tennis facility (equating to one court). It is not considered likely therefore that new provision would have a significant impact on the rates of physical activity.

In respect of the proposed gym, the proposed facilities would tend to operate at the top end of the market with higher membership fees than others in Hertford. Given this approach to market segmentation, therefore, it is unlikely that the operation will have a significant impact upon overall participation.

Given that the applicants have not implemented their previous consents might suggest that market conditions are not optimal.

Members will note in para 10.47 of the Committee Report that Officers were exploring further the provision of funding for health care services. Officers have written to NHS England in respect of this matter and no response has been received. Officers do not therefore consider that there is sufficient evidence to determine whether the financial contribution of £16,879 towards health care facilities is CIL compliant and it is recommended that this contribution is omitted from the heads of terms.

Members will also note that clarification is being sought in respect of contributions relating to secondary education childcare and nursery provision. The consultation response from HCC Development Services Team identify a requirement for financial contributions towards nursery provision and childcare towards Spins pre-school. No requirement for secondary education provision is identified.

Members will note from the Committee Report that it is not clear from the plans submitted as to how refuse storage facilities will be stored on the site. Officers are of the opinion that this detailed matter be dealt with by a planning condition.

3/16/1918/REM – Land east of Cambridge Road, Puckeridge and 3/16/1218/FUL – The Chestnuts and Glanton, Puckeridge An additional representation from <u>Standon Parish Council</u> has been received which relates to both applications in Standon (3/16/1218/FUL and 3/16/1918/REM). The Parish Council draw Members attention to the recently published pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan and request that both applications be deferred until further discussion with the Neighbourhood Planning Team.

Concern is raised in respect of the access with Cambridge Road and the A120; access arrangements associated with LPA reference 3/16/1918/REM; the density and hard surfacing associated with LPA reference 3/16/1218/FUL.

The Neighbourhood Plan is a material consideration but is in its first draft and subject to its first round of public consultation. Accordingly, it is at a position where only very limited weight can be attached to it.

Outline planning permission has been granted at appeal in respect of the land east of Cambridge Road. That outline planning permission approved the access arrangements which are shown on the plans submitted in respect of the current application for approval of the reserved matters (LPA reference 3/16/1918/REM). The layout, scale, appearance and landscaping associated with the application are considered to be acceptable, for the reasons set out in the Committee Report.

With regard to LPA reference 3/16/1218/FUL – for the reasons set out in the Committee Report, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable having regard to the balancing exercise in paragraph 14 of the NPPF. With regard to access and highway matters, the development is considered to be acceptable having regard to the advice from the Highway Authority.

Officers comments above regarding the weight

3/16/1218/FUL

The applicant has responded to the latest comments from the Parish Council referred to above. The applicant comments that they are not prepared to review the proposals in response to the publication of the Standon Neighbourhood Plan. The applicant comments that there has been various discussions and negotiation between the applicant, Officers and other consultees which is provides an acceptable scheme in terms of detailed layout and is compliant with relevant policies. The Neighbourhood Plan is at too early a stage for any material weight to be attached to it. The concept scheme which accompanies the Neighbourhood Plan illustrates a poor layout and is deficient on a number of grounds. In addition, the numbers of units for the different allocated sites in the Neighbourhood Plan which are based on SLAA (Strategic Land Availability Assessment) are indicative only.

which can be attached to the Neighbourhood Plan are relevant here. There is no planning or policy reason to require the applicant to reconsider their development proposals in light of the recent publication of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Council are able to determine the planning application accordingly.

The applicant also indicates that, if the application is deferred, an appeal against non-determination will be submitted.

This page is intentionally left blank