

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Extn: 2174
Date: 26 February 2015

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 25 FEBRUARY 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 25 FEBRUARY 2015
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 25 February 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 3/14/1827/FP – Clements Farm, Brickendon Lane, Brickendon</p>	<p>1 additional response received from a previous objector, confirming that they maintain their previous objection</p> <p>An objector has copied the Council in on a letter to Natural England, seeking their comments on the potential for the development to harm local biodiversity</p> <p>Two further submissions have been received from objectors. The first questions how a connection is to be made between the proposed development at the national grid. They are concerned at the development that may be required in the green belt to achieve this. The second objector has raised a concern that the planning officer has identified the proposals as inappropriate in the green belt. He sets out that the applicant is of the view that the proposals are appropriate agricultural development, which he indicates to be wrong.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No submissions have been received from Natural England by the Council in relation to the issues raised. It is considered that the Councils local advisors, Hertfordshire Ecology, remain best placed to advise on this matter.</p> <p>In relation to the first point, the applicant advises that a small transformer building will be required. This could be placed within the building for which permission is now sought. Only trenching for cables will be required in addition. In relation to the second it appears there is no disagreement between the applicant and officers. The development is not considered to be development which is appropriate for the green belt. The objector is concerned that additional material has been submitted by the applicant which is not available to the public. This is not the case. Officers have reached their view on the</p>

	<p>Additional representation from agent/applicant following discussions with Environment Agency re: flooding: The clearing of the road drains is the responsibility of Hertfordshire Highways. The Environment Agency hope that the level of gravel in the drains will be reduced week commencing 16th February</p> <p>Officers also understand that a message in support containing a summary of points, dated 24 Feb 15, has been circulated by the applicant to all committee members.</p> <p>A Councillor has requested clarification on anaerobic digestion.</p> <p>The National Grid have confirmed that they have no objection to the development on plant safety grounds, provided that the applicant work with them to ensure that the development would not affect pipelines etc.</p>	<p>appropriateness of the development independent to the applicant. That is the correct procedure.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>No additional comments</p> <p>An anaerobic digester breaks down biodegradable waste, in the absence of oxygen, within a sealed vessel. It produces gases such as methane and carbon dioxide which in this case would be used to power the associated combined heat and power plant. The remaining solid waste can be used as a fertiliser.</p> <p>An appropriately worded directive can be added to the decision, in the event that permission is granted, to advise the applicant accordingly.</p>
<p>5c 3/14/1841/FP & 3/14/1842/LB</p>	<p>The Council's Head of Communications, Engagement and Cultural Services comments that the site could be put to valuable use for community, arts and start-up</p>	<p>Recommended <u>condition 4</u> requires the submission and approval of details of the refurbishment of the business and community use space prior to the</p>

<p>26, Old Cross, Hertford</p>	<p>businesses. There are a number of expressions of interest, including potential expansion of the successful Hertford Theatre Band. The Council would be interested in playing a leading role in enabling this outcome. Clearly substantial refurbishment works are required to bring the spaces into viable use and it is the economics of this work and any lease terms that are critical to realising the envisaged use.</p> <p>The Council's <u>Legal Officer</u> comments on the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Consider making condition 4 a Grampian style condition as it is onerous and expensive and suggests that that works are subject to approval to ensure quality b) Questions whether recommendation is consistent with S106 of the Sainsbury's application <p>It is noted that proposed condition 9 of 3/14/1841/FP repeats the proposed condition 3 of 3/14/1842/LB .</p>	<p>commencement of the development. Recommended <u>condition 10</u> requires the submission of details of the management of community uses.</p> <p>The fabric of the building is already repaired but refurbishment to enable occupancy is warranted to secure the full use of the heritage asset. The wording of recommended condition 4 contains the appropriate details approvals and trigger mechanism.</p> <p>The S106 obligations of the Sainsbury's approval would be superseded by this grant of full planning permission and there is no conflict.</p> <p>Recommended that condition 9 is omitted as unnecessary.</p>
<p>5d 3/14/2301/FP – Roebuck Hotel, Wadesmill Road, Ware</p>	<p>1 further neighbour objections on grounds of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP/health facilities oversubscribed • Excessive care homes in Ware. Lack of parking • Overdevelopment of area • Previous proposal was at lower density and was refused on flood risk– this proposal much more dense 	<p>Most of the matters already addressed in Report. In terms of excessive concentration of care home – Officers do not consider that this would result in harm to the character of the area, nor would it conflict with Policy in this respect.</p>

<p>5e 3/14/1615/FP Former Helmer and Dyer Yard, High Wych</p>	<p>Officers are aware that the applicant's agent has circulated some photomontages to all Members.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>5f 3/14/1851/FP Tesco, 1 Bishop's Park Centre, Bishop's Stortford</p>	<p>1 further letter of representation has been received from a local resident raising concerns in respect of noise and disturbance; impact on property value; loss of parking spaces which would exacerbate on street parking.</p>	<p>Noted - these concerns have all been addressed in the report.</p>