

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Management  
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 5 February 2015

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Management  
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 4 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 – 8)

Yours faithfully,

Peter Mannings  
Democratic Services Officer  
East Herts Council  
[peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk)

**MEETING** : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
**VENUE** : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD  
**DATE** : WEDNESDAY 4 FEBRUARY 2015  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

### Date: 4 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
<b>5a</b> <b>3/14/1583/FP</b> <b>Hoggetts End,</b> <b>Bishop's</b> <b>Stortford</b>		<p>Fencing has been erected along certain site perimeter boundaries. Submitted plans show the implementation of hawthorn hedging to the boundaries. Whilst fencing can provide immediate privacy for new residents and some protection from construction works, a further condition is recommended to secure the implementation of hedging to soften the impact of the fencing in due course.</p>
<b>5b</b> <b>3/14/2037/CC</b> <b>Land at</b> <b>Bishop's</b> <b>Stortford</b> <b>north</b>		<p>With regard to transport modelling (report para 6.14), further work is being undertaken to ensure that the County Council is fully informed when reaching a decision on this matter. The modelling includes scenarios where there is no A120 access. The output from this will not be available for a further 2-3 weeks – but this Councils position, requiring it to be carefully considered, is set out in recommendations 2 and 3.</p> <p>In relation to the requirement for an emergency/ service access prior to the creation of a new A120 access</p>

	<p>A representation has been received from a local resident in objection to the proposals on the grounds of location (being a more costly development than if implemented at Patmore Close), impact on green belt and the potential for community use.</p>	<p>(report para 6.18), this matter remain to be resolved. County Officers are exploring a number of options and it is considered that this matter will be addressed through the County Council consideration of the application.</p> <p>An issue in relation to the need for land remodelling to enable the playing field use and the agricultural quality of the playing field land have been raised. Whilst remodelling will be required, and the land is of a good quality, it is considered that the benefit of the development in meeting the need for educational capacity in the town, continues to outweigh harm.</p> <p>These matters, other than the relative cost of development, which is neither conclusive or a consideration to which weight of any significance can be gives, these matters are addressed in the report. In any event, the proposals are not ones on which this Council is to make a decision. Representations will be forwarded to the County Council as decision maker.</p>
<p><b>5c</b> <b>3/14/2023/OP,</b> <b>Land south of</b> <b>Tanners Way,</b> <b>Hunsdon</b></p>	<p>A further representation from the <u>Environment Agency</u> is received which sets out that some complaints have been received from residents in the locality regarding the Hunsdon Skips site relating mainly to noise matters. There may be some noise, dust, and/or vermin issues to the proposed new development, given the proximity to the Hunsdon Skips site.</p>	<p>The comments from the Environment Agency are noted. Having regard to the advice from the Environmental Health Team it is considered that there is sufficient information to determine the acceptability of noise impact and, for the reasons set out in the Officer Committee Report an appropriate level of amenity will be provided for future residents of the development, in accordance with policy ENV25 of the Local Plan.</p>

	<p><u>Herts Ecology</u> comment that they have no reason to disagree with the findings of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. Further ecological surveys or assessment are not required and the suggestion of maximising biodiversity on site through existing hedgerow enhancement and the provision of new hedgerows is welcome.</p> <p>Officers understand that the applicant's agent has circulated a letter dated 3 February 2015 to all Members of the Committee.</p>	<p>Noted, the proposed development will not result in significant harm to ecology or protected species in accordance with policy ENV16 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Contents noted.</p>
<p><b>5d</b> <b>3/14/1514/FP,</b> <b>Grain store,</b> <b>Kettle Green</b> <b>Road, Much</b> <b>Hadham</b></p>	<p>Two additional representations have been received raising concern with the width of the road and access onto Much Hadham High Street for HGV's; mud on the road; additional lorry movements and that the grain store will attract rats.</p> <p>The <u>applicant</u> has provided further information regarding traffic movements from Brands Farm and the proposed grain store as follows:-</p> <p>When Brands Farm was operational, traffic movements would have gone through Much Hadham village. The majority of the wheat crop would be moved out from Brands Farm between October and January, with oilseed rape being brought into the site during July and August.</p>	<p>Noted. The highways concerns raised are addressed in the Officer Committee Report and other legislative controls exist in respect of pest control matters.</p> <p>Officers note the comments made and, for the reasons set out in the Officer Committee Report and, having regard to the comments from the Highways Authority, there is not considered to be a significant impact in highway safety and access terms, or neighbour amenity.</p>

	<p>With regards to the proposed development, all HGVs movements will be asked to go through Barwick as there is difficulty with turning at Much Hadham.</p> <p>The movement of crops associated with the proposed development will potentially be spread throughout the year and vehicle movements should be lower.</p> <p>Due to the lack of drying facility in the Brands Farm store, in a wet harvest the crop would have to be moved twice; once into the store and out again to be dried, and then back into the store. This would have resulted in additional HGV and tractor and trailer movements. The movement of crops out of the proposed store will be dictated by the commodities market.</p>	
	<p><u>Herts Ecology</u> comment that they do not have any known biological (habitats or species) records for the application site but there are records of bats roosting within 600 m of the site.</p> <p>From the plans provided, the development will result in the loss of a small amount of arable land but protected species or habitats will not be a constraint to the development and further ecological surveys are not required.</p> <p>The Nimney Bourne watercourse and associated</p>	<p>Noted, the proposed development will not result in significant harm to ecology or protected species in accordance with policy ENV16 of the Local Plan. Recommended planning condition 8 in the Officer Committee Report will ensure that the lighting does not result in harm to protected species.</p>

	<p>riparian tree belt to the west of the site has the potential to act as a habitat corridor for foraging and commuting bats and any lighting should be directed away from those features to eliminate any potential disturbance.</p> <p>The provision of the new attenuation pond and the tree and shrub planting along the eastern and southern boundaries will provide biodiversity enhancements.</p>	
<p><b>6. 3/14/1627/OP – Land East of Cambridge Road, Puckeridge</b></p>	<p>6 representations have been received which reiterate the concerns set out in section 5 of ERP B (Essential Reference Paper B).</p>	<p>The concerns raised are noted. The concerns raised are addressed in ERP B and do not alter Officers recommendation, as set out in the Report.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank