

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Management  
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 15 October 2015

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Management  
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 14 OCTOBER 2015**

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](mailto:peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk)

**MEETING** : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
**VENUE** : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD  
**DATE** : WEDNESDAY 14 OCTOBER 2015  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

**Date: 14 October 2015**

**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
<p><b>5A</b> <b>3/15/0206/OP</b> <b>Hunsdon</b> <b>Lodge Farm,</b> <b>Hunsdon</b></p>	<p>Six additional representations have been submitted in a standard format by residents in objection to the proposals. The objections mainly relate to the proposed surface water drainage strategy as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Future maintenance;</li> <li>- Impact on existing flooding in Wicklands Road;</li> <li>- Impact on a flooding assessment being carried out by HCC;</li> <li>- That the proposals do not meet the sequential test requirements of the NPPF.</li> </ul> <p>In addition concern is raised in relation to the capacity of the foul drainage system. The objectors consider the proposals unsustainable as a result and that other housing provision is</p>	<p>The additional comments that have been received in relation to highways matters, access, school provision and the overall sustainability of the development proposal have not raised issues in addition to those covered in the report.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of the development of this site together with development at the Tanners Way site (for which the Council has resolved to grant planning permission) is not considered to be significant and demonstrably harmful (as per the test in para 14 of the NPPF) such that the refusal of the application would be warranted.</p> <p>The concerns raised by third parties with</p>

	<p>being made in the village.</p> <p>In addition to the standard format representations, there are a further four representations, again in objection and relate to drainage matters, in some cases setting out concerns in some detail.</p> <p>Officers are aware that five submissions have been made direct to Members of the committee. Four are from local residents and, in addition to the drainage matters above, raise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wildlife interest on the site;</li> <li>- Unsafe access from Wicklands Road and impact on road safety in the area;</li> <li>- Access by refuse collection vehicle</li> <li>- Change in character of Wicklands Road</li> <li>- Additional traffic</li> <li>- Impact during construction;</li> <li>- Inadequate school capacity</li> </ul> <p>In addition, Members have received a representation direct from <u>Hunsdon Parish</u></p>	<p>regard to the proposed drainage strategy and in-particular the maintenance of such features with private gardens are acknowledged. The County Council comment that such features should be the responsibility of the home owner and, in practice will require little maintenance. Further, as set out by the Councils Solicitor, it can be made clear through the S106 agreement that maintenance of these features is the responsibility of the home owner but the legal agreement can require entry to inspect these SuDS features and, if necessary, ensure maintenance.</p> <p>The proposed SuDS features are considered to comprise of acceptable drainage solutions which meet the sustainable objectives of the Councils SFRA, Local Plan policy and the NPPF. The matter is therefore addressed in an appropriate and acceptable way.</p> <p>Given the Solicitors comments with regard to compliance with CIL regs, it is proposed that</p>
--	---	--

<p><u>Council</u> objecting strongly pointing out that full access details are to be submitted and that Hunsdon generally and this application in particular represent unsustainable locations for development. In addition to the matters of local flooding and access, the PC refers to the ability of the school to expand, stating that the school has no room.</p> <p>The <u>Councils Solicitor</u> comments with regard to the proposed s106 agreement. She sets out that, in order to meet CIL requirements more specific funding projects should be identified in some instances.</p> <p>With regard to the SuDS proposals, the <u>Solicitor</u> sets out initial provisions that could be included into a legal agreement to secure the longer term management.</p> <p><u>Hertfordshire County Council Environmental Resource Planning Team</u> have provided additional comments in regards to the maintenance of SuDS. They comment that the SuDS within private gardens would be the</p>	<p>the contribution toward recycling collection facilities should specify that this will be utilised for the benefit of residents of the settlement. It is not considered that CIL constraints will be potentially breached with regard to the Village Hall and therefore further qualification is not required.</p> <p>The Solicitor refers to the potential funding for health care facilities, currently identified as, if required. Given that further certainty is not yet available, Members are requested to delegate authority to Officers to clarify the NHS funding requirements and to formulate the legal agreement on further information that comes forward in respect of this.</p> <p>The Solicitor suggests amendment to some conditions. However, these are not considered necessary as they are either dealt with at the reserved matters stage, or the amendments would not meet the tests to be applied to conditions.</p>
--	--

	<p>responsibility of the property owner which is considered to be acceptable as the SuDS feature is primarily serving that property. If the SuDS features were serving multiple properties then easements would be required and in all likelihood they would need to be maintained by some form of management company / adoption body.</p> <p>It is for the developer to ensure that management of the SuDS are properly conveyed as part of the homeowners obligations and that the maintenance requirements are understood. In practice the SuDS will require little maintenance, but the home owner would need to know that they must maintain them and what that maintenance regime looks like.</p>	
--	---	--

<b>5C</b> <b>3/15/1498/VA</b> <b>R</b> <b>GSK site,</b> <b>Priory Street,</b> <b>Ware</b>		<p>Members are advised that the OS extract attached to the report is incorrect and an amended plan is attached to this Additional Representation sheet.</p>
<b>5B</b> <b>3/15/1028/FUL</b> <b>Rivers</b> <b>Hospital,</b> <b>Sawbridgewo</b> <b>rth</b>	<p><u>Sawbridgeworth Town Council</u> has no objection subject to the lighting scheme being approved by condition.</p>	
<b>5D</b> <b>3/15/1460/FUL</b> <b>Southern</b> <b>County Park,</b> <b>BS</b>	<p><u>Bishop's Stortford Town Council</u> objects to the application on the basis that the proposals are out of keeping.</p>	<p>Whilst inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and of utilitarian appearance, Officers consider that the need for this secure building for the future maintenance of the Park, together with the existing and proposed landscaping at the site, is sufficient to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.</p>
<b>5E</b> <b>3/15/1546/HH</b> <b>4 Yew Tree</b> <b>Cottage,</b>	<p><u>Standon Parish Council</u> comment that there is a right of access for 3 Yew Tree Cottage through the rear garden of the application site to the highway.</p>	<p>Officers note the comments received. However, any right of access is a private matter which is not material to the determination of the planning application.</p>

<p><b>Colliers End</b></p>	<p>Hertfordshire Ecology comment that they do not hold any ecological data for the property but do have records of bats activity nearby. However, given the condition of the building it is considered that the likelihood of bats being present is slight and an informative is recommended advising that building work cease in the event that bats are found.</p>	<p>Having regard to the advice received, the proposed development will not result in harm to protected species in accordance with policy ENV16 of the Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>5F 3/15/1267/HH and 3/15/1268/LB C – Front Lodge, Moor Place, Much Hadham</b></p>	<p>Two additional representations received which comment that they would like the Committee to note that the land on the western side of the High Street is considerably higher so any additions will inevitably have an impact, and raises concerns that the proposed extension would be partly built on agricultural land.</p>	<p>Noted – these concerns have already been addressed in the report.</p>