

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Extn: 2174
Date: 24 March 2016

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 23 MARCH 2016

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 – 4)

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 23 MARCH 2016
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee**Date: 23 March 2016**

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, 3/15/2556/VAR Mill Road/ Mead Lane, Hertford	<p>2 further neighbour letters have been received objecting on the grounds of inadequate parking and traffic volumes in the area.</p> <p>Officers understand that the applicant has circulated a letter to all DM Members dated 18 March 2016. The letter explains the changes being proposed and provides illustrative drawings.</p>	<p>The amendments will not change the previously approved parking provision or traffic generation elements of the scheme.</p> <p>No further comment.</p> <p>Officers have recently agreed lighting details under Condition 6. It is therefore recommended that the wording of this condition be amended to refer to 3/15/0413/FUL instead of 3/14/0590/FP. Other condition submissions are still under consideration.</p>
5b, 3/15/1584/FUL Hadham Industrial Estate	<p>The applicant has circulated a letter dated 14 March 2016 to Members of the Development Management Committee. The applicant refers Members to the job creation that the development will provide, particularly having regard to other nearby approved residential development.</p> <p>One additional representation has been received in</p>	<p>Officers note the representation received in support</p>

<p>5b – 3/15/1584/FUL Hadham Industrial Estate cont'd...</p>	<p>support of the application from an address outside the District</p> <p>Further representation has been received from a neighbouring property raising concern with the recommendation from the Landscape Officer and also seeking the comments of the Council's Environmental Heath team regarding the acoustic report submitted by that neighbour (see below).</p> <p>The <u>Environmental Health Team</u> has provided additional comments in respect of the acoustic report which has been submitted by a neighbouring property.</p> <p>They note that the report generally agrees with the approach and assessment that has been carried out in the applicant's noise assessment. The area of difference is that the neighbour's noise assessment questions a number of areas of uncertainty in the report, which have also previously been noted by the Environmental Health Team. The neighbours noise assessment concludes that several areas of uncertainty exist that could or may significantly affect the outcome of the assessments.</p> <p>The Environmental Health Team has also noted these deficiencies but has concluded that, subject to a number of conditions, the development would be acceptable in terms of noise generation.</p>	<p>of the application.</p> <p>The concerns raised in respect of landscaping are noted – the representation from the Landscape Officer does not raise concern with the impact of the development on the Landscape and no planning conditions are recommended in regard to landscape matters.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge the further comments from the Environmental Health team and the recommendation that planning conditions could adequately control noise generation at the site. However, several of the suggested conditions do not appear to meet the necessary planning test for conditions and would require the submission of further noise assessment. It is considered that further assessment should be carried out prior to any permission being granted in order to fully assess any noise implications from the development.</p> <p>No change is therefore recommended to the second reason for refusal.</p>
---	--	---