

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Extn: 2174
Date: 8 January 2015

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 7 JANUARY 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 7 JANUARY 2015
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 7 January 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 3/14/1583/FP Dane O’Coys Road, Bishop’s Stortford</p>	<p>The <u>Councils Solicitor</u> considers that more guidance should be provided to the committee to enable it to make a decision in relation to the issue of tenure of the affordable homes to be provided. She is concerned that an adverse precedent would be set if the 100% shared ownership option is selected.</p> <p>Members have been circulated with a communication on behalf of the applicant dated 2 January 2015. This sets out that a further reason for the proposal to provide shared ownership properties on site is to minimise the impact on the owners/ occupiers of the adjacent Hoggetts End property. Those owners do not consider that social rented properties would not be appropriate in this part of the town which is characterised by larger family homes. In addition, it is pointed out that consultation carried out by the applicant locally indicates a preference for the provision of shared ownership homes.</p> <p>Three further responses have been received. Two set out the preference for the provision of shared ownership</p>	<p>Officers consider that the applicant in this case has made an interesting offer, and it has to be properly evaluated, despite the normal policy position, as £500,000 is a very substantial sum that would add to the affordable housing stock.</p> <p>Members are advised not to give significant weight to the point made in the communication circulated on behalf of the applicant or the additional submissions which indicate a preference only for shared ownership properties. One of the communications has set out reasons as to why this is considered to be the case. These are planning considerations, though not strong reasons in this case.</p> <p>With regard to any impact on the visual character of the area, this will occur in any event whether the properties are social rent or shared ownership.</p> <p>In other cases however, the reasons for only</p>

	<p>properties on the site. One cites location, access, nearby facilities and the ease of management as the reasons for this. One is in objection on the basis of additional traffic, potentially on Whitehall Lane, and additional demand for educational, medical and transport facilities.</p>	<p>supporting shared properties are not articulated in planning terms – they are only expressed as a personal preference. These should not be given weight</p> <p>Members are advised that, if they feel they wish to support the £500,000 funding option, because it is a sound offer in financial terms, they should articulate that the personal preference of those who have commented on the proposals has been given no weight in the determination process.</p>
<p>5b 3/14/0369/FP Jolly Waggoners site, Much Hadham</p>	<p>Officers are aware that Members have been circulated (on 5 Jan 2015) with a statement, in the name of over 50 local residents, which sets out positive and negative aspects of the scheme – but which is in objection to the proposals. With the same message, Members received a letter dated 31 Dec 2014 from a local resident on behalf of ‘Protect Much Hadham’. This sets out a commentary on the content of the report and is in disagreement with the conclusions of it.</p> <p>The applicant has submitted an amended layout plan to show the provision of an increased level of parking provision within the site. The amended plan shows the provision of an additional 15 parking spaces and a potential overflow area to the north east of the site. The plan therefore demonstrates that between 65 and approximately 80 parking spaces could be provided within the site.</p>	<p>These communications do not raise new issues but clearly take a different view with regard to the weight to be assigned to them. Officers consider that, in the context of the NPPF, positive weight can be given to the proposals and they can be supported.</p> <p>Officers note the amended plans submitted but, for the reasons set out in the Officer Committee Report (paragraphs 7.42 – 7.47) consider that appropriate levels of parking (50 spaces) are provided. However, should Members consider that additional parking be required, the amended plan demonstrates that additional parking can be provided. The plan has not been subject to</p>

	<p><u>Landscape Officer:</u> Recommends approval of planning permission. There is a lack of landscape planting to soften the building at the main entrance and a 2/3 metre wide grass verge or plant beds could be considered. The car park has an engineered appearance which could be softened – careful consideration of soft landscaping and suitable hard landscaping will need to be undertaken to ensure the parking area assimilates with the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Two additional representations in support of the planning application have been received.</p> <p>An additional representation in objection to the application has been received, raising concern in respect of the design and scale of the proposed building and with regard to the loss of the existing pub building, which, it is set out, has been an important ‘landmark’ building for a century and a half of a type now becoming rare. The reopening of a pub is welcomed, but the existing buildings should be retained. The previous landlord has indicated that it could be made successful as it was previously. Archaeological issues are also referred to.</p>	<p>consultation, but the additional parking can be required through planning condition.</p> <p>Officers note the comments received and consider that the submission of detailed information regarding landscape treatment through a planning condition will address the comments made.</p> <p>Noted – the comments made reflect that set out in the Officer Committee Report.</p> <p>Noted – the comments made reflect that set out in the Officer Committee Report.</p>
--	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank