## **Public Document Pack**



Chairman and Members of the Development Management Committee Your contact: Extn: Date: Peter Mannings 2174 20 August 2015

cc. All other recipients of the Development Management Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 19 AUGUST 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:

4. 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 19 AUGUST 2015
TIME	:	7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

Page

ω

## East Herts Council: Development Management Committee Date: 19 August 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
4a. 3/14/2200/OP	<u>Herts Ecology</u> have commented that the design of biodiversity enhancements referred to in the application documents should be prepared and submitted to the local	Noted. Details of biodiversity enhancements shall be referred to the Planning Inspectorate with a recommended condition in the event of the appeal being allowed.
Land south of Froghall Lane, Walkern.	planning authority as a condition of any approval. With respect to a local objection that there are slow worms on the site, they do not see this as a constraint to development. Consultants found little potential for reptiles and arable fields are not generally considered suitable habitat.	
	<u>Walkern Parish Council</u> and 69 other residents have requested the Council lobby the Planning Inspectorate to hear the appeal through an informal hearing as opposed to via Written Representations. A hearing is felt to be the only way the level of local public interest and opposition can be conveyed to the Inspectorate and is justified by the scale of the development.	Noted. The recommendation (b) invites member's guidance. See also comments in the report at Section 9.0.
	HCC Environment and Resource Planning, as Lead Local Flood Authority, since April 2015, have advised that they will be making representations to the Planning	The Councils own in house Engineer has been fully involved in the assessment of surface water drainage for this application since last year but it is

	Inspectorate with regard to the application subject of appeal. They have requested information from East Herts on flooding incidents to properties at Moors Ley. Although they have initially objected to the latest proposal at the site for 62 dwellings (due to an inadequate Flood Risk Assessment) they now require more time to review this	important that HCC as Lead local Flood Authority are now engaged. Their submission will be made directly to the Planning Inspectorate. In view of the HCC objection to the second reduced application Officers may use the requested delegated authority to amend the appeal case in the light of HCC
	objection and also more time to form a view on the appeal scheme.	submissions as an objection to the Inspectorate on flooding grounds appears likely.
	<u>Herts County Council Rights of Way</u> would support an appropriate off road scheme to facilitate safer access for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders linking Walkern and Stevenage. This has been explored in the past and forms part of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan. A previous proposal running along Stevenage Road was estimated at £75,000 at 2008-09 prices. They suggest a budget of £90- 100,000 plus a suitable commuted maintenance sum.	Officers have noted objector's comments about the lack of a safe cycling route to Stevenage and raised this question with HCC. A link for pedestrians, cyclist and horse riders appears both feasible and worthwhile but could only be delivered as part of any S106 agreement with the applicant to promote sustainable transport modes in the event of the appeal being allowed.
4c 3/15/1363/VAR Land North of	Buntingford Town Council has no objections to the proposals.	Noted.
Hare Street Road	The <u>Historic Environment Unit</u> consider that the proposal is unlikely to impact on heritage assets of archaeological significance.	Noted.

4e 3/15/0863/HH Three Lillies Lodge	The Environment Agency has commented that although the site is within 20 metres of a watercourse and in Flood Zone 3, in this instance they have no concerns that cannot be addressed by the use of the Flood Risk Standing Advice. The applicant should be made aware that their prior consent is required for any work within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the Pole Hole Brook.	The Flood Risk Standing Advice states that in this case the internal floor levels should be no lower than those within the existing dwelling, which in this case they are.
	Officers are aware of an email that has been circulated to Members from the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling house. This representation has raised concerns in respect of the inadequate infrastructure that serves the dwelling within the application site and questions the distance between the boundary wall and the proposed extension, which they claim to be 6.65 metres, whereas the applicant has indicated that this is 8.85 metres.	In respect of the concerns raised that the infrastructure that serves the dwelling is inadequate, Officers advise is that this should not be afforded significant weight in this matter. With regard to separation distance, the report (see paragraph 7.12) indicates that a space of 9.5 metres would be retained between the extensions and the neighbouring dwelling house. Officers estimate that a distance of approximately 8.5 metres would be retained between the proposed extensions and the boundary with this neighbouring dwelling house.

This page is intentionally left blank