

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Extn: 2174
Date: 17 September 2015

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 16 SEPTEMBER 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 – 10)

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 16 SEPTEMBER 2015
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 16 September 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>5b 3/14/2144/OP Patmore Close Bishop's Stortford</p>		<p>With regard to the proposed legal agreement matters, authority is sought for the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to amend and add to the proposed provisions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction of an additional clause which restricts the implementation of the proposed or other development on the application site until an alternative site (the land within ASR 1-4 or other appropriate site) is within the control of HCC (if implemented this will replace proposed condition 3) - The addition to the viability reassessment provisions (ERP A, point 1) that reassessment is required if the land swap to provide the proposed secondary school site on ASRs 1-4 does not take place, prior to commencement of the development; or as per current parts (1) and (2) but with the addition to (2) that reassessment would be required if there was a delay of 18 months – applied repeatedly if

	<p>The <u>Bishop's Stortford Town Council</u> considered the proposals further at its meeting of 7 Sept 2015 and these comments in objection replace those at para 5.1 of the report:</p> <p>The <u>Committee</u> felt that the egress and ingress was hazardous as the emergency services shared the</p>	<p>necessary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That a further legal agreement (or unilateral as appropriate) be entered into between the applicant HCC and the Council that restricts the use of the secondary school site land within ASR1-4 to secondary education purposes once it comes into the ownership of HCC. - That a supplementary agreement be entered into which covers enforcement provisions. <p>Further consideration has been given to the requirements of policy ENV25 (noise sensitive development). This matter is referred to at para 9.2.3 of the report which indicates that the proposed flatted block is intended to assist in the attenuation of noise from the adjacent emergency services facility.</p> <p>To further address this it is recommended that a further condition is introduced which will require the submission of details and plans as part of the reserved matters submissions which will set out how this potential noise impact will be attenuated.</p> <p>The comments of the Emergency Services are the subject of another update for members</p>
--	---	--

	<p>access onto Hadham Road with the other residents. The Committee would like to see a dedicated access for the emergency services</p> <p>Contrary to (Neighbourhood Plan Policy) TP1</p> <p>Smarter Choices are limited. Residents prefer to use their cars to travel around Town. More finance needed to support this initiative</p> <p>Concerns were raised by the Committee for the access off Hadham Road as it is currently a busy road and this will inevitably cause extra congestion especially from the development on ASR5</p> <p><u>Emergency Services</u> comment as follows:</p> <p>There are no issues as long as the developers work with the service to maintain suitable, unrestricted, flow for retained fire fighters responding to their pagers during the development phases using the highways infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Highway Authority has accepted the modelling work undertaken, including additional modelling of the impact of the development in combination with ASRs 1-2 and the new secondary school on ASRs 3-4.</p> <p>Further funding for Smarter Choices has not been sought by HCC Highways.</p> <p>The Highway Authority is satisfied that the Patmore Close access will function satisfactorily</p> <p>It is suggested that an addition to the list of requirements in condition 16 <i>Construction Management Plan</i> is made by amending item b) as follows:</p> <p>b) The number and routing of delivery vehicles and site access, <i>including, in consultation with the emergency services, arrangements and controls at the access to ensure that retained fire fighters have unobstructed access to their station on Patmore Close when responding to emergency call-out;</i></p>
--	---	--

<p>5d Former Brickfields, off Cole Green Way, Hertingfordbury</p>	<p>Letter (dated 5th Sept) from agent responding to the Officer Report. Comment on the following:-</p> <p>Safe Access – confirm they have agreements in place to access the full length of the emergency access. Can demonstrate a safe means of access during flood conditions.</p> <p>Remote location and sustainability – the access route and siting of buildings reduces pedestrian travel distances to the bus stops in Hornsmill Road. Meets Government guidelines for travel distances.</p> <p>Encroachment on Woodland – shared communal facilities would be located within the main buildings not freestanding in the woodland. Existing unplanted areas to be used for outside activities (gardening and tennis). No plans to remove protected trees. If the access road to the care home impacts on trees it could be re-positioned nearer the embankment away from such trees.</p> <p>Mineral and clay extraction – former uses are detailed within Argyle Consultants site check report, the Archaeological Statement, tourist information photograph and 2 previous local residents letters.</p> <p>Applicants submitted a copy of the ‘Written Statement to Parliament – Housing Delivery’, delivered 28 January 2015. Document details how Councils will be</p>	<p>The applicant has served notice on owner of former PH, but has no legal agreement to demonstrate that access can be achieved across the former PH frontage. No confirmation from owner.</p> <p>Already addressed within Report.</p> <p>No change to view within report. Re-siting of the access road towards the embankment would take it outside of the red edge application site area.</p> <p>No further comments</p> <p>Noted. No further comments.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>assisted to build more homes and that the government's ambition is to build more on brownfield sites.</p> <p>Applicants submitted a Briefing Note from Tetlow King which details the implications of the NPPG and care accommodation for older people.</p> <p>Applicant has submitted an email dated 15 Sept stating they served notice on Punch Taverns at the time of submitting the application.</p> <p>Letter from agent (dated 9th Sept). State that although the Environment Agency have withdrawn their objection, they have identified 2 alternative means of providing safe access. Option A) is from the north east of the site, passing the western side of the football club and exiting on the Mimram Road Employment Site. Option B) is an alternative option crossing the river behind the former PH and exiting further east along Hornsmill Road.</p> <p>Email from agent (dated 16th Sept) detailing that third party responses are at 59 objectors and 48 supporters.</p> <p>Further letters from local residents (18) in support of proposal. Additional comments are that it will benefit the Football Club and users of the Cole Green Way as it will open up access. Will create jobs</p>	<p>Noted. Already addressed within the Report.</p> <p>Noted, but no legal agreement to demonstrate that access can be achieved across the former PH frontage.</p> <p>Although the application is in outline form, there is no evidence to demonstrate that either of these access routes are deliverable in terms of ownership/legal agreements (and outside of the red edge application site boundary), nor have they been formally assessed in terms of appropriateness from visual and landscape impacts, highway safety, flooding or similar. The amended access points would not overcome the 3rd reason for refusal.</p> <p>Officers have re-calculated the responses, which total:- 77 objectors and 48 supporters.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Further 2 letters from local residents in objection.</p> <p>Comments from <u>NHS England</u> It maintains its earlier position, but updates that the only GP practice approaching constraint has since become constrained, due to an increase in patient registrations, with the remaining GP practices also seeing a significant increase in patient registrations. Therefore there is even more of a shortfall in general medical service capacity within Hertford.</p> <p>A S106 contribution is requested to support those practices most impacted and to make this scheme favourable to NHS England.</p> <p><u>Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)</u> expressed concern about an overstretched community services. Based on cost impact forecasting calculations, the potential cost could be £542,718, requested as a result of additional health infrastructure.</p> <p><u>National Grid</u> – has concerns with the proximity of the development in relation to 2 high pressure gas pipelines.</p>	<p>No new issues raised.</p> <p>Noted..</p> <p>Noted. No further comments. The applicant has seen the figures and in principle says they have no problem with the requested funding. They will be willing to negotiate and provide funding via a S106 agreement</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>5e 3/15/1019/REM Longmead Buntingford</p>	<p>Submission from the owner/developer of adjoining land to the north at Deacons Place.</p> <p>Reiterates previous concerns that the landscaping fails to provide any screening.</p>	<p>Proposals are considered acceptable</p>

	<p>Concerns are raised with the hard landscaped terraces that been constructed in the rear gardens of some of the dwelling</p> <p>Questions are raised with how the LPA can enforce the proposed landscaping given that people have already moved in to some of the dwellings that have been constructed.</p>	<p>These have been approved and discharged already as part of LPA reference 3/12/1417/RP.</p> <p>Enforcement would take place in the normal way which applies after new residential development has passed into private ownership</p>
<p>5g 3/14/2013/FP Tewin Bury Farm Tewin</p>		<p>Two amendments are recommended to conditions 4 and 5 to ensure that they refer to the most up to date drawings and supporting documents as follows:-</p> <p>Condition 4 – to refer to drawing number 3614 102 Rev E and ‘as set out I section 2.1 of the revised Design, Access and Planning Statement dated June 2015 and received by the Council on 9th July 2015’.</p> <p>Condition 5 - to refer to drawing number 3614 102 Rev E and ‘as set out I section 2.2 of the revised Design, Access and Planning Statement dated June 2015 and received by the Council on 9th July 2015’.</p>
<p>5h 3/15/1011/FUL Walnut Close Much Hadham</p>	<p>The <u>Councils Solicitor</u> recommends that the proposed tenancy arrangements for the affordable housing are set out in the recommendation</p>	<p>Noted, the recommendation is amended to 1 unit shall be provided as rented and 1 unit as shared ownership</p>

This page is intentionally left blank