

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Extn: 2174
Date: 9 November 2017

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 8 NOVEMBER 2017

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

MEETING : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
VENUE : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD
DATE : WEDNESDAY 8 NOVEMBER 2017
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 8 November 2017

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>5a 3/17/1922/OUT</p> <p>Acorn Street, Hunsdon</p>	<p>In respect of paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2 of the report, it is advised that the appeal for 3/16/1742/FUL has now been dismissed. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would harm the setting of a Grade II listed building, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, and would not represent a suitable and accessible site for new housing.</p> <p>2 further letters of objection have been received; however no new points are raised.</p> <p>Letters have been received from the agent setting out their disappointment that the application has been referred to Committee without being given the opportunity to address issues. They have submitted additional information and an amended site plan, and have requested that consultation be carried out with the Highway Authority, Conservation team, and LLFA prior to determination. They have requested that the application be removed from the agenda and that an Extension of Time be agreed to address these issues.</p>	<p>Noted. No implications for the consideration of this application.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Officers have responded to the agent and advised that the application will not be removed from the agenda to enable re-consultation on amended plans/additional information. Even if technical matters can be addressed through further discussion, Officers remain fundamentally concerned in respect of reasons for refusal 1 and 2. The applicant has been advised that they are welcome to withdraw the application and re-submit following discussions held through the Council's</p>

	<p>They comment on each issue as follows: <u>Landscaping</u> – The applicant contests that site assessment and mitigation is adequate to address landscape impacts, and that matters referred to in the Landscape Officer’s comments would be for consideration at the Reserved Matters stage. <u>Education</u>: The applicant is in discussions with HCC. <u>Access</u>: The amended site plan shows pedestrian access to the B180 and details of pedestrian links to improve permeability. <u>Flood Risk</u>: Consultants are currently working to prepare additional information to overcome the LLFA objection. <u>Heritage Impacts</u>: The amended plan shows greater spacing to respect the setting of the Pill Box. It is confirmed that the Pillbox falls outside the applicant’s ownership.</p> <p>They also comment that recreation land to the north (across which a pedestrian access is proposed) is not owned by the Parish Council, but by the Diocese of St Albans and leased to the Parish Council.</p>	<p>pre-application advice service.</p>
<p>5c 3/17/1861/FUL Watermill Industrial Estate, Buntingford</p>	<p><u>EHDC Engineer Advisor</u> - Additional SuDS (Sustainable urban Drainage Systems) are now detailed on drawing s3203/11b Rev B and would provide green infrastructure helping to reduce flood risk whilst also providing biodiversity and amenity to the site and within the revised FRA (Flood Risk Assessment) dated Sept 2017. Should the proposal be implemented the SuDS as detailed should be constructed.</p>	<p>The LLFA (Local Lead Flood Authority) and EHDC Engineer consider that the drainage strategy is satisfactory, and a condition is included in the recommendation to address design details.</p>

	<p><u>Buntingford Town Council</u> – In principle no objection, but there are many issues pertaining to increased vehicle movements, the condition/maintenance of feeder roads within the estate and an improvement public ROW FP27 to be addressed before a decision can be made. It is well documented that there are width restrictions on Aspenden Road which cause congestion and can be hazardous to road users and pedestrians. The situation in regard to the footway that runs to the west of Aspenden Road should be replaced by a footbridge across the river at a point south of the junction with Fairfield to join ROW FP27. The roads within the estate are in a poor state of repair. If the proposal is approved there must be conditions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estate Roads to be brought up to an acceptable standard; • A programme of ongoing estate road maintenance; • The section of road adjacent to the Household Recycling Centre to the access junction be adopted by the Highway Authority; • To comply with Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Policy T6 a contribution be made towards the Buntingford Community Area Transport Scheme. <p>The proposal is in line with NP Policies BE2 and BE4, however, Policy BE3 identifies the need to address congestion and road safety.</p>	<p>The content of the representation are noted but the comments have no bearing on the planning issues relating to the application.</p>
--	--	---

	A representation has been received raising issues about the DM Committee procedures.	These comments have no bearing on the assessment of the planning application.
5d 3/17/1791/FUL Hockerill College, Bishop's Stortford	<p><u>EHDC Engineering Advisor</u> comments that the site is located in floodzone 1 with the majority of the site away from overland surface water flows, but there are multiple historical flood incidents shown near the site along Stortford Hall Park. The development will increase the area of impermeable land at the site, and concerns are raised that additional obstructions from the bridge would increase flood risk. It is concluded that the proposed drainage features are medium to poor quality with limited amenity or biodiversity provision. Opportunities to make use of the flat roof as green infrastructure have not been taken. The proposals are therefore not sustainable and are likely to increase the risk of flooding.</p> <p><u>Leisure Services</u> raises concerns that the proposed community hours are limited and should extend beyond 8pm on weekdays, 4pm on Saturdays and 12pm on Sundays.</p>	<p>Officers comment that this is not a statutory consultation as the development is not a 'major'; and a condition is recommended to require the submission of a sustainable drainage scheme (as per previous approval 3/12/2161/FP.)</p> <p>The College has advised that it may not be possible to materially extend these hours due to the need for facilities to be used by boarders, and associated safeguarding issues. Officers are satisfied that the timings proposed still represent a considerable benefit to the scheme and consider that an appropriate Community Use Agreement can be secured by condition in consultation with Leisure Services.</p>

	<p><u>Cllr Stainsby</u> welcomes the investment in the school’s sports facilities, but objects to the new access and car park on the grounds of increased traffic and parking. He raises concerns in respect of the content of the Transport Statement and the Highway Authority’s consideration of the proposal.</p> <p>A petition of 136 signatures has been received in objection to the access road, stating it will bring additional traffic onto Stortford Hall Park at a point which is unsafe, and parking for only 16 vehicles will result in increased parking and congestion along Stortford Hall Park.</p> <p>The covering letter raises further points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stortford Hall park is a known rat-run, the junction is dangerous, and there is inadequate visibility; • Inadequate parking provision will result in overflow parking in an area where cars are already dangerously parked; • Query whether enough investigations have been made into the ownership of the ditch and whether enough measures have been taken to safeguard against flooding <p>4 further letters of objection have been received raising no new points.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. No new points raised.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

This page is intentionally left blank