

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Extn: 2174
Date: 13 March 2014

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 12 MARCH 2014

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 – 10)

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 12 MARCH 2014
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 12 March 2014

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 3/13/1399/OP Aspenden Road, Buntingford</p>	<p>Condition 12 should be amended to refer to Aspenden Road being widened to 5.5m and not 4.8m.</p> <p>The Council's <u>Landscape Officer</u> confirms that the play area is acceptable in landscape terms. No change to the previous recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The Council's <u>Solicitor</u> suggests that the S106 requirement to manage and fund the open space should be worded more clearly and queries provision of a bridge over the River Rib.</p> <p>The <u>Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)</u> have no further comments to make – they continue to object to the proposal.</p> <p><u>Aspenden Parish Council</u> comment that their existing playground and recreational facilities to the south of the site will be used by the new residents and are in need of upgrading and ongoing repair. They request a financial</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>A financial contribution would only be required if the open space and play area land were adopted by the Council for future maintenance. The requirement for the bridge is to access the open space, and is considered to be justified and deliverable.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The application makes provision for an on-site play facility and this is discussed in the main report. It is therefore not considered reasonable to request additional contributions towards improving off-site</p>

	<p>contribution of £10,000 towards improvements and maintenance for 3 years.</p> <p>Officers understand that Members have received a letter from <u>Buntingford Town Council</u>, dated 5th March, expressing concerns about the cumulative impacts of this application, together with other recent approvals and proposed development around the town. They express concern that the town's infrastructure will be unable to cope with the resulting level of growth.</p>	<p>facilities.</p> <p>The impact of the proposed development on the town has been assessed in the main report and ERP A. In addition to the comments made within the report already, officers would comment as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for sewerage and drainage. Thames Water and Affinity Water have appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure works are planned and carried out to meet demand. Regardless of scale, these matters can be satisfactorily resolved and are not considered justifiable grounds to refuse the application. • <u>NHS England</u> has not raised concerns about GP capacity in the town and will continue to monitor the situation and plan for improvements accordingly. • <u>In respect of Schools</u>, the Education Authority has indicated that:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Pre-school</u> capacity is likely to increase as a result of national policy and can be achieved in a variety of ways including within childminders homes. A refusal on lack of capacity would not therefore be justified. - <u>At Primary level</u> – Layston First School and Millfield First School have the capacity to
--	---	--

	<p>An email has been received from the agent clarifying that although there is no footway on the western side of Aspenden Road opposite the site, the new footway south of the site will provide a footway through to Aspenden.</p>	<p>extend by 1.5FE (equates approximately to 750 – 1,275 dwellings). There is also 1FE of capacity in the school planning area (a further 500-800 dwellings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At <u>Middle School</u> level – Edwinstree has the potential to expand by 1.3FE (equates approx to 650 to 1,105 dwellings) and Ralph Sadler, which is within the school planning Area has the capacity to expand by 2FE (approx 1000 dwellings) - At <u>Upper</u> level, Freman College has a current 2FE deficit but this is largely due to their admissions policy and could be resolved. Additional land is set aside on the proposals at Buntingford North to assist with possible future expansion if required. <p>Cumulative <u>Highways impacts</u> have been assessed by the Highway Authority and considered to be acceptable as set out in para 5.9 of the report.</p> <p>Officers are satisfied that the effects of the development can be appropriately mitigated through conditions and S106 obligations.</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	---

	<p>9 no. additional letters of representation have been received which raise similar concerns to those already summarised in paragraph 4.1 of the report and, in addition:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That proposal for residential development to the north and south of the town are preferable and maintain the valley perspective of the town; • There is no provision for additional infrastructure to support the development; • There has been recent flooding of the site; • Loss of wildlife on the site; • Noise from the A10 will be harmful to future occupiers; • The development would destroy the natural boundary between Buntingford and Aspenden; • Roundabout suggested at junction with Station Road; • Increased waiting times for doctors, and lack of school places; • Cars cannot pass 'freely' in the road; • Additional accidents have occurred, not on highway records; • Construction traffic will cause even more danger; • Query why the site is not listed in the District Plan; • Query where people will take their recycling; • Is Buntingford the target for all future developments in East Herts; • Cumulative effect of developments on the town and traffic; • Local roads are not maintained. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>No further comment – issues have been addressed in the main report and ERP A.</p>
--	--	--

<p>5b, 3/13/2036/FP- Dane Tree House (Henry Moore Foundation)</p>	<p>The applicant's agent has submitted a representation to clarify a few points made within the Officers Committee report.</p> <p>They note that a revised landscape plan has not been included within the recommended Condition 2 (approved plans).</p> <p>They have stated that it is important to note that the extensions proposed to Dane Tree House would not only accommodate space for a shop and a café but also for public WCs', as currently there is heavy reliance on Portaloos on the opposite side of the road in the peak season which leads to lots of crossing and re-crossing of the road. With the public WC's all on the Danetree side there should be less activity in and around the village green.</p> <p>They comment that a shuttle bus will only operate at weekends and Bank Holidays. It will run from 1st May to the end of August and it will be free to encourage maximum use at busy times.</p> <p>Contrary to some of the representations received from residents they state that there is no Damien Hirst exhibition planned for 2014. The 2014 show is an exhibition where a number of contemporary sculptors will be submitting artwork to illustrate how the themes of Moore's work are still relevant today – so whilst there will be lots of pieces there will only be one by Hirst.</p>	<p>Officers advise that Drawing No. 866-SK-02 A should be added to the list of plans within the condition 2.</p> <p>No further comment.</p> <p>No further comment.</p> <p>No further comment.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>They would like it to be noted that the use of the overflow car park at the Hoops has subsisted for well over 10 years and therefore the proposals are not to extend this area. Approximately one third of the existing overflow car park will become integrated with the main Hoops car park and will be resurfaced with reinforced gravel (as will the existing main car park). The remainder of the existing overflow car park (approximately two thirds) on the east side will be resurfaced with reinforced grass and so will retain a green appearance.</p> <p>10 No. additional representations have been received from neighbouring residents which raise comments that are already detailed within the Officers report.</p> <p>A representation has been received from the Perry Green and Green Tye Preservation Society which comments that the amended plans received for the car park is a welcome improvement and they question whether this means that the reconfigured ponds will be restored to the village green.</p> <p>In response to the late representation received from the applicant's agent they comment that the good weather of 2013 may reoccur, a S106 agreement to limit the number of visitors should be considered, there is a lack of information in respect of the online ticketing service that is proposed, there is no information in respect of the impact upon water and sewerage systems.</p>	<p>The impact of the proposal for the Hoops car park has already been discussed within the Officer's report.</p> <p>No further comment.</p> <p>Officers would comment that they are not aware of any current proposals in respect of the village green.</p> <p>A Section 106 agreement to restrict visitor number is not considered to be necessary in this case and would be difficult to enforce. Officers have no information to suggest that the proposal would have a significant impact upon the water and sewerage systems; however, if planning permission is granted then the responsibility would be with the applicant and the water and sewerage system provider to</p>
--	---	---

	<p>They comment that the Highway Authority has taken the applicant's evidence in respect of traffic and accidents to be correct and have not mentioned emergency vehicles. The Top Field overspill car parking is still proposed to be used. The HMF's plans to restrict the number and size of coaches will be difficult to enforce against. The HMF may be classed as a charity but they will still look to increase visitor numbers to make more money.</p>	<p>ensure that the existing facilities and their capacity would not be unduly affected.</p> <p>No further comments. The impact of the development in respect of traffic and parking has been adequately assessed within the Officer's report.</p>
<p>5d, 3/13/2297/FP Garage site, Gilpin Road, Ware</p>	<p>One additional letter of representation has been received from a local resident who considers that only 2 x 1-bed flats should be erected on the site to give more parking spaces to local residents.</p> <p>The Councils solicitor has recommended a condition requiring the dwellings to be retained as affordable housing.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. However, the parking requirement for a one bed dwelling and a two bed dwelling as set out in the Councils SPD is similar (1.25 spaces per unit as opposed to 1.5 for a two bed unit). Officers therefore consider that the provision of three parking spaces for the two flats would remain necessary and appropriate whether they are one bed or two bed units.</p> <p>As the development in this case is within the town boundary of Ware and for only two dwellings, there is no policy requirement for the provision of affordable housing. Additionally the Housing Association is grant funded on the basis that the units will be let as affordable units. Officers do not therefore consider that such a condition is necessary in order to make the development proposal acceptable.</p>

<p>5e, 3/2067/FP – Bromley Farm, Much Hadham</p>	<p>The Landscape Officer objects to the proposed development. The Landscape Officer considers that the agricultural buildings proposed to be demolished are easily recognisable architectural features, most commonly associated with the rural landscape which contribute to, rather than detract from the rural character of the countryside. The character of the countryside is not specifically related to neatness or tidiness but more as a working or natural environment. The Landscape Officer does not therefore concur with the applicants comments that the provision of dwellings will provide a significantly more attractive rural character and sustainable development and that the existing buildings are scruffy and detrimental to the environment.</p> <p>The proposed layout for the development is reasonably well arranged within the confines and geometry of the site, but this is not considered to justify the applicant's comments that the proposed development will provide a significantly more attractive rural character and sustainable development. The Landscape Officer comments that the open agricultural sheds are currently being used for bulk storage and are not vacant and appear to continue to serve a useful purpose / function.</p> <p>The proposed development will result in a significant change to the landscape character and appearance of this section of Bromley Lane as a result of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Officers note the comments from the Landscape Officer which are broadly reflective of the comments made in the Officer Committee Report.</p>
---	---	---