

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Extn: 2174
Date: 12 November 2015

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 11 NOVEMBER 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 – 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 11 NOVEMBER 2015
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee**Date: 11 November 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>5a, 3/15/0928/F UL Adams Yard, Hertford</p>	<p><u>Herts CC</u> have maintained their objection in the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment. Provision of more details such as a detailed surface water drainage layout is required within a revised FRA.</p> <p>In response to this the Applicant has submitted representation to say that this is unreasonable and that to not condition matters is uncooperative. The project was approved in 2010 and due to a technical oversight did not proceed sooner. They argue that the FRA demonstrates that the flood risk on the site will not increase and will not increase the flood risk to others. They agree to implement a suggested range of Sustainable Drainage options as part of discharging the planning condition.</p>	<p>While it is not a preferred situation, Officers have recommended approval in this specific case with a sustainable drainage condition to agree the final details of a surface water drainage scheme. Officers have also secured confirmation of specific SUDS features as part of this. The site is constrained to make radical changes in its design and it is also an important site to regenerate in the Conservation Area. Weight also has to be given to the fact that it replicates a previous approval. Deferral of the application to secure a revised FRA is likely to result in minor changes but will result in delay to a scheme that should be progressed for the benefits as outlined in the report.</p>

	<p><u>Herts County Highways</u> have no objection to the amended plans and reiterate previously recommended conditions.</p> <p>East Herts <u>Waste Services</u> have commented that access in and out for waste collection vehicles is tight. They also seek confirmation that the bin stores will provide for other businesses backing onto Maidenhead Yard. They also are concerned about the distance between the flats to the bin stores.</p> <p>Applicants have confirmed that the bin storage area will be available to nearby businesses and occupants of the Seed Warehouse</p> <p>Herts <u>Rights of Way</u> request a minor rewording of the obligation</p>	<p>Noted. No further comment</p> <p>The access is limited but cannot be improved due to the constraints of listed buildings.</p> <p>The provisions for bins and waste are covered by the planning conditions and S106. It is recommended that the S106 obligation to establish a Management Company can be reworded to confirm the company <i>“is responsible for management of the refuse facilities, cycle parking, landscaped areas and surface water drainage systems”</i>.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Reword S106 Obligation 1 to state</p> <p><i>The dedication of public pedestrian rights of way across the application site connecting</i></p>
--	---	--

<p>5b, 3/15/1756/F UL Church House, Church Street, Ware</p>	<p>An additional third party representation has been received in objection. This is based on additional traffic that the proposals will generate in an area where roads are difficult to use. There is insufficient parking and the proposals result in the loss of a town centre employment use.</p>	<p>These issues are covered in the report and no additional comment is set out here.</p>
--	---	--