

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Tel: 01279 502174
Date: 9 September 2020

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 9 SEPTEMBER 2020

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 - 12)

Yours faithfully,

Peter Mannings
Democratic Services Officer
East Herts Council

peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk

MEETING : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
VENUE : PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD
VIRTUALLY ON ZOOM
DATE : WEDNESDAY 9 SEPTEMBER 2020
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee**Date: 9th September 2020****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
5a, 3/20/2020/FUL Land East of Manor Links (BISH9), Bishop's Stortford	<p>Drafting Error Pages 81 and 82 under Hertfordshire County Council the specific projects to which contributions in the S106 agreement refer were omitted. These are as follows:</p> <p>Primary Education: proportionate contributions towards the new 3FE primary school at the Bishops Stortford South development (BISH5).</p> <p>Childcare Services: towards childcare provision in the new primary school at the Bishops Stortford South development (BISH5).</p> <p>Youth Provision: increasing provision at the Bishop's Stortford Young People's Centre.</p> <p>Library Provision: providing additional capacity at Bishop's Stortford Library.</p>	<p>Hertfordshire County Council has requested that these details be included to ensure that the contributions can be appropriately secured and allocated and it is appropriate to amend the wording of the S106 requirements accordingly.</p>

	<p>Correction Page 70 Para 8.43. The updated parking standards referred to in this paragraph state confirm that “ outside of the main settlements, the remainder of the District falls within Zone 4”. Therefore the up to 25% reduction in parking requirements does apply to this site and the proposed provision of 126 spaces within the site exceeds the minimum requirement.</p>	<p>This information is provided for clarity</p>
	<p>Late representation received following drafting of the report. Raise following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequacies of the report: Not all objections are listed, and not all are addressed. The application should be deferred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report provides a brief summary of the objections/concerns raised, the objections are available for all to view on the Council’s website. The objections have been rechecked and no major concerns have been omitted from the list. Any issues raised as being inadequately addressed are covered in this summary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Concern that Cycle way is to go through private Road.- This is not part of the application proposals. -Concern that Driving range may not move and high netting would be required. – The Section 106 agreement will prevent use of

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report depends on developer’s consultant’s reports and conclusions are untested, particularly with regard to highway impacts. 	<p>the driving range land adjacent to the site if the development goes ahead. The proposed new driving range is the subject of a separate application.</p> <p>-Concern that the development will encourage more airport parking on street.</p> <p>- Adequate parking to meet the needs of the development is proposed. The development should not therefore worsen the existing situation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports submitted in support of a planning application are by professional consultants and therefore carry some weight, in addition reports are considered by professionals within the Council, the County Council and other statutory bodies, who provide advice With regard to the Highways report this has been assessed by the Highway Authority and considered to meet requirements. The Highways response is available to view and is summarised and considered within the Officers report.
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report does not address need for architecture and layout to change to take into account coronavirus issues (wider roads, better soundproofing, space between parking spaces as recommended by WHO and SAGE • Community gain does not include provision for Birchwood High School, which is most likely to be impacted. • Unspecified newts were found on site, ecology was ignored when developer removed trees. • Flooding in gardens is resulting from loss of water lift and transpiration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As yet there is no planning advice or policy in place which would require these measures and we cannot require them. • The Education Authority has determined where education money is required as a result of the development and has not requested money towards Birchwood High School. Money can only be required where there is scope for works to be carried out to meet the needs arising from the development. • The ecology issues are fully covered within the report. No permission was required from the Council for the landowner to remove the trees. • Flood risk is fully considered within the officer's report, and conditions are attached to ensure that the development does not result in any increase risk of
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased night time noise from M11 as a result of loss of trees. • Town Council concerns of overdevelopment, traffic impact on existing homes, nearby schools and town centre shops has been disregarded. • All construction traffic should go through the golf course to avoid traffic and pollution harm to existing residents. • Spoil from the development should be used within the golf course site as part of the dune proposals to minimise CO2 , air and noise pollution. 	<p>flooding to adjacent properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The trees could have been removed at any time as they were not protected, The proposed built development will no doubt provide a barrier to noise. • Concern over overdevelopment is addressed in the report in terms of design, traffic impacts and congestion and mitigation. • The golf course is not within the applicants ownership and we cannot require access over this land. However proposed condition 18 requires submission of a construction environment management plan in order to minimise disruption and pollution etc during construction. • Proposed Condition 34 requires details of waste management from the site. We cannot require that spoil be used on land outside the applicants ownership, or control, but waste will be minimised and re
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the significant and unmitigated noise from the proposed driving range impact on health and mental wellbeing of existing and new residents • What is to be built is opaque and should be re presented more clearly, for instance what is proposed on rear boundaries and building heights. <p>Does East Herts have documentation and mechanisms in place to control and manage Stonebond and its contractors to avoid detriment to residents and school children using Norris Close, Manor Links and Cecil</p>	<p>used within the site where possible. Stonebond have confirmed that they will liaise with the Golf Course owner and where possible will seek to utilise spoil within that land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Golf range application is a separate application and its potential impacts on existing and proposed residents will be considered though that application. • The plans submitted meet planning requirements. They are to scale (so heights do not need to be annotated) and provide suitable levels of detail. A close boarded 1.8m high fence is proposed on the rear garden boundary between the new properties and those in Manor Links, Cecil Close and this is shown on the submitted Landscape plan. • See proposed condition 34.
--	---	--

	<p>Close?.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inlet Roads should be within the control of East Herts to ensure that key services can get in and out. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway issues are considered in the report and the proposals meet highway standards. The two accesses are to be adopted and will be within the control of the County Council. As shown on the submitted plans.
	<p>Further representation received following drafting of the report and before 5pm. Summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too many houses already built in this area no need for additional housing here. There are too many units proposed, more than in the plan. Traffic assessment was made a a quiet time (June 2019) when school traffic will have been reduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is an allocated site in the Local Plan. If it is not built on other sites will need to be identified to meet housing need. This is covered in the officer's report In the absence of identified harm from larger numbers, there is no grounds to refuse. Traffic and Highway issues were assessed by the County council and found to be acceptable.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy requirement to improve Dunmow Road/Manor Links Junction has been ignored. • No play area is proposed. Already 91 dwellings here not served by community open space, to add another 70% with no facilities is unacceptable. • There are drainage issues,(raised water table from loss of trees. • Development should be lower density to reflect that it was Green Belt land. The proposed high density scheme does not take opportunity to provide proper sustainable development. • Why infill here where there will be impact on wildlife. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst mentioned in the policy, when presented with the proposals the Highway Authority are satisfied that no junction improvements are required to make the scheme acceptable. As such it would be unreasonable to refuse on this basis. • This is covered in the report. It is unreasonable to expect the developer to rectify an existing perceived shortfall. • Drainage issues are covered in the report and are the subject of conditions. • This is covered in the officer's report. The development is not high density • This is an allocated site in the Local Plan . Mitigation is proposed that will result in a small net gain in biodiversity.
--	---	--

<p>5b, 3/182735/FUL Land at Cambridge Road (SAWB4) Sawbridgewor th</p>	<p>In response to an officer query the Highway Authority have provided further clarification as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Road Speed Limit There are no current plans to reduce the speed limit in the vicinity of the site, to 30mph as a result of the development. The potential lowering was on the original application drawings and was considered and reviewed at the Speed Management Group Meeting at HCC prior to responding to the application. The Group contains professionals such as safety Auditors, Police and network Managers for the Area, and they concluded that the reduction was not warranted here. • Signalised Junction Traffic modelling did not indicate that a signalised junction was warranted here. The road layout geometry will be subjected to a Stage One and Two Road safety Audit as part of the Technical Audit by HCC Implementation Team when implementing the new road scheme. If any issues arise as a result of the audits these can be dealt with through the S278 Highways agreement. • Bus stops proposed within the Carriageway. 	
---	--	--

	<p>Because there is often difficulty for buses re-joining the carriageway, bus stops are often provided in carriageway in order that delays to passenger transport are kept to a minimum, and this is considered the appropriate option here. The prioritisation of passenger transport over private cars is of course part of the longer term sustainability strategy.</p>	
	<p>Late Representation Received after drafting of report and before 5pm on day of committee. A further response has been received raising the following concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals are disappointing and fall short of what was discussed with the developers at an early stage. A much higher level of sustainability including provision of solar panels must be insisted upon and what is promised must be secured. • Infrastructure proposals are inadequate and improvements should be made to the A1184 prior to construction • These matters should be raised with the developers 	<p>These tissues are covered in the report and it is considered that the proposals are policy compliant.</p>