

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Management  
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 23 June 2016

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Management  
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 22 JUNE 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 – 4)

Yours faithfully,

Peter Mannings  
Democratic Services Officer  
East Herts Council  
[peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk)

**MEETING** : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
**VENUE** : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD  
**DATE** : WEDNESDAY 22 JUNE 2016  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

**Date: 22 June 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
<b>5a</b> <b>3/16/0899/REM</b> <b>Hunsdon</b> <b>Lodge Farm,</b> <b>Hunsdon</b>		Paragraph 3.2 refers to an ongoing appeal in relation to a previously refused outline planning application at the site (3/15/0206/FP). Members are advised that a decision in respect of that appeal has now been received. The appeal has been allowed with a full award of costs granted against the Council.
<b>5b</b> <b>3/15/1733/FUL</b> <b>Ashpoles</b> <b>Southmill Rd,</b> <b>Bishop's</b> <b>Stortford</b>	<p>Members will have received a note and report from Project Centre, forwarded by Cllr Gary Jones and relating to car parking issues. The report analyses parking provision to be made as part of the proposals and sets out a number of summary details.</p> <p>The <u>applicants</u> have copied a note to all DM committee members which sets out details in relation to parking provision and on site drainage (the basis of the previous deferral).</p>	<p>The Project Centre report provides further helpful analysis of the local parking issues. The summary points are noted. The consultants summarise points that are both favourable and unfavourable in relation to the proposals. It remains officers view that the impact of the proposals in relation to parking matters are acceptable and not so harmful that they outweigh the favourable aspects of the proposals.</p> <p>The points that the applicants raise are noted</p>

	<p>The Councils <u>Engineers</u> have indicated that concerns remain with regard to the potential of the site to flood and that the SUDs proposals do not adequately provide landscape and wildlife benefits and water quality improvements.</p> <p>The Councils <u>Solicitor</u> confirms that the heads of terms for the s106 agreement should include the provision of affordable housing units (39%) - of which the tenure split will be 75% rented and 25% shared ownership – and the provision of fire hydrants.</p> <p>The Solicitor also identifies the need for additional conditions to deal with foul waste drainage and ecological mitigation.</p>	<p>The Engineers position is noted in the report. It is considered that concerns raised do not outweigh the benefits of development .</p> <p>It is proposed that the heads of terms for the legal agreement and the conditions be amended to include these items.</p> <p>In response to an enquiry from a DM Member, it is also proposed that a condition be applied seeking details of the management and allocation of the parking provision at the site.</p>
<p><b>5c</b> <b>3/16/0689/FUL</b> <b>101-113</b> <b>Gladstone</b> <b>Road,</b> <b>Ware</b></p>	<p><u>Ware Town Council</u> welcomes the redevelopment, but has serious concerns over the insufficient parking provisions in an already very congested road.</p>	<p>Report corrections:</p> <p>Proposal and Para 3.2 : The proposal is for <b>3x 1</b> bed flats, 7 x 2 bed flats....<u>not 3 x 3</u> bed flats.</p> <p>At para 10.5: The adopted parking standard is a maximum of <b>16</b> spaces <u>not 18</u>. The Emerging Parking Standard is <b>10</b> spaces <u>not 11</u>.</p> <p>Para 10.6. The shortfall is between <b>2</b> and 8 spaces. <u>not 3</u> and 8 spaces.</p> <p>Members are referred to the attached corrected KEY DATA sheet:</p>