Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the Your contact: Peter Mannings

Development Management Extn: 2174

Committee Date: 15 September 2016

cc. All other recipients of the Development Management Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 14 SEPTEMBER 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 – 6)

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 14 SEPTEMBER 2016

TIME : 7.00 PM



East Herts Council: Development Management Committee Date: 14 September 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 3/16/1164/FUL South of Martlets, Hunsdon Road, Widford	Widford Parish Council has indicated that it is in the process of formulating schemes for investment into the facilities at the village playing field and village hall. It seeks funding provision to support these proposals if development is permitted. The Ware Cricket Club (which is based at the cricket pitch site in the village) has indicated that membership is available to new residents and that it has aspirations to invest into the facilities provided at the site.	The development will place additional demand on the public facilities provided in the village. The committee report currently identifies the maximum funding provision that could be secured in relation to mitigating the impact of this demand. The development will place additional demand on sporting facilities that are available in the village, regardless of their means of provision. The committee report currently identifies the maximum funding provision that could be secured in relation to mitigating the impact of this demand. Funding provision in this case would meet the necessary regulatory tests and it is appropriate then to secure funding toward the mitigation of the impact of demand on facilities. It is recommended that, if Members are supportive of these proposals, Officers are delegated to determine the final funding provision and the purposes to which it is secured, in negotiation with the developer and the local

		providers of facilities. It would not be appropriate to secure funding for maintenance purposes in this case, as no additional facilities are to be provided by the developer which are proposed to be passed to the Council for future maintenance.
5b 3/16/0404/FUL Gates, Gascoyne Way, Hertford	Three further letters have been received objecting to the application on the following grounds: • Loss of employment at Gates • Loss of winter sunshine to No.5 West Street • A further retirement building is not needed as Bentley House is only half occupied	These issues are covered within the report.
	One further letter has been received commenting that the proposal would put greater strain on parking in West Street but relieving this through the development funds could be considered a benefit. One further letter has been received expressing interest in a retirement flat.	The parking pressures are noted and a contribution towards a residents parking scheme in West Street would be sought in the event that planning permission were to be granted.
		Correction to report: Para 10.1 should read that the site is not within a designated employment area.
5c 3/16/1228/FUL Elbert Wurlings,	Amended plans have been submitted to show the visibility splay / chamfered corner at the basement car park entrance as required by Highways.	Plans GA 511 PL1, GA 513 PL1 and GA 811 PL1 are superseded by GA 511 PL2, GA 513 PL3, GA 811 PL2.
Pegs Lane, Hertford		Include original submitted plans to proposed condition 2. GA 303 – 308 PL1.

The <u>EHDC Parking Manager</u> has requested £10,000 funding for the design, consultation and implementation of a Residents Parking Scheme in nearby residential streets.

The <u>EHDC Environment Manager - Open Spaces</u> has requested contributions in accordance with the SPD on S106 towards projects to enhance play and develop the public spaces at Castle Grounds and Hartham.

Residents Management Company of Pimlico Court object to alterations to Pegs Lane, loss of double yellow lines and provision of parking bays. This is unnecessary, impinging on safety and emergency vehicle access.

The provision would help to address wider impacts of parking and are accepted by the applicant. It is recommended that planning permission be subject to a legal agreement which secures the contribution.

The SPD guidelines would warrant funds of £57,000 in total (£57,197). The provision addresses wider impacts on open space, outdoor sports and play associated with the development.

Funding provision in this case would meet the necessary regulatory tests and it is appropriate then to secure funding toward the mitigation of the impact of demand on facilities. It is recommended that, if Members are supportive of these proposals, Officers are delegated to determine the final funding provision and the purposes to which it is secured, in negotiation with the developer and the providers of facilities.

The details are to be finalised but the principle of enhancing the road is part of the planning conditions of the approved McCarthy and Stone application. Access and safety matters will be agreed as highways approval is required.

5f	The EHDC Environment Manager - Open Spaces has	Funding provision in this case would meet the
3/15/0561/FUL	requested contributions in accordance with the SPD on	necessary regulatory tests and it is appropriate then
20 Amwell	S106 towards projects to enhance play and develop the	to secure funding toward the mitigation of the impact
End, Ware	public spaces at Buryfields and/or Presdales Recreation	of demand on facilities. It is recommended that, if
	Ground	Members are supportive of these proposals,
		Officers are delegated to determine the final funding provision and the purposes to which it is secured, in negotiation with the developer and the providers of facilities.