

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Management  
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 26 June 2014

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Management  
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 25 JUNE 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:

6. 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 25 JUNE 2014  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

**Date: 25 June 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><b>6a</b> <b>3/13/1967/FP</b> <b>Sovereign House, Hale Road, Hertford</b></p>	<p>The <u>Chairman of the Committee</u> has requested more details of the proposed density of the development and car parking standards for Members.</p>	<p>The proposed 83 dwellings on a developable gross site area of 0.4 hectares, equates to 207.5 dph (dwellings per hectare), a high density scheme. As a comparison the neighbouring Pimlico Court development is built at a density of approx 135 dph.</p> <p>The site is within parking Zone 3 (as identified in the Councils SPD), but on the edge with Zone 2. Under the Council's adopted parking standards, the maximum Zone 3 provision for the proposed development would be 124 spaces. The maximum for Zone 2 would be 83 spaces. The provision of 83 spaces within the development is therefore 41 spaces below the maximum for Zone 3, a significant difference.</p> <p>Parking provision will be at almost 1 space per dwelling. As a comparison Pimlico Court parking was provided at 1.38 spaces per dwelling.</p>

	<p>The <u>applicant</u> has submitted further plans which illustrate in 3D the scope for enhancement of Pegs Lane and also a section drawing identifying the heights of the existing building with the proposal.</p> <p>They have also made proposals for various minor amendments of the planning conditions relating to:-</p> <p>Waste Materials (condition 10)</p> <p>Green Travel Plan (condition 18)</p>	<p>The Pegs Lane sketch and Plan A203 B with section will be available for committee members.</p> <p>Officers have discussed this with the applicant and recommend the following minor changes</p> <p>Condition 10. Amend wording to include “<u>where feasible</u> re-use existing materials”</p> <p>Condition 18 Amend wording as underlined below:-</p> <p><u>Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved</u>, the applicant shall implement a full "Green Travel Plan" with the object of reducing the number of residents and visitors travelling to the development by private car. The Plan shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority <u>prior to commencement of above groundwork's</u>. Within six months of commencement of the activities approved by this planning permission, the applicant shall submit a monitoring report to the Local Planning Authority and Highway Authority outlining the effectiveness of the Travel Plan and any additional or amended measures necessary. This monitoring report must be to the satisfaction of the local planning authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.</p>
--	---	--



	<p>The March 2014 Acoustic Report shows noise levels significantly higher than criteria BS8233 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings. While it anticipates they will meet the standards a robust specification is needed to evidence compliance with this.</p> <p><u>County Highways</u> have noted the removal of a layby to Hale Road on plans. They are of the view that the treatment to Pegs Lane entrance can be achieved via a planning condition.</p> <p>The <u>Crime Prevention Design Advisor</u> has made comments on the underpasses to Gascoyne Way and Hale Road. Police data for the last 2 years can trace no crime attributed to the underpasses. The main problem is the perceived Fear of Crime rather than actual crime levels. Further survey of footfall is recommended to ascertain footfall during hours of darkness. Some minor</p>	<p>adding "...<i>The details shall include an open landscaping arrangement, allowing for acoustic screening but without the indicated private gardens for the area immediately north of Block A</i>".</p> <p>Officers recommend that Condition 29 be amended to read</p> <p><i>"Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, noise control and attenuation measures for the new dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall ensure the building is attenuated to comply with the standards of BS8233 as stipulated by Acoustics Report Sharps Redmore March 2014."</i></p> <p>Noted. Covered within report.</p> <p>Noted. There is a recommended planning condition for external lighting of the scheme but this does not apply to the underpasses which are outside the site and the red line area so owner's agreement would be needed and funding secured to progress any enhancements.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>alterations to allow for visibility with reduced landscaping at entrances and use of curved mirrors or more costly CCTV or use of energy efficiency LED lights or even a Green lighting system.</p> <p>The <u>applicant</u> has responded that they would be prepared to commit to a survey of the underpass to Gascoyne Way and funding of up to £10,000 for appropriate measures via a S106 obligation.</p> <p>The Council's <u>Environment Manager Open Spaces</u> has commented that the Hertford Castle Play Space does not have sufficient play value for the demand placed upon it nor has it been upgraded for many years. It is one of the improvements that only external funding by s.106 contributions can enable.</p>	<p>Officers recommend the S106 obligation to survey and improve this underpass as identified be added to others with the application.</p> <p>Noted. The financial viability assessment for the scheme has shown that not all the s.106 requirements can be met. See section of 7.51 – 7.56 of the report. (however members will note the recent offer of funds for the Gascoyne Way underpass)</p>
<p><b>6c</b> <b>3/13/2086/FP</b> <b>Land at Penningtons, Bishop's Stortford</b></p>	<p>10 No. additional representations of objections have been received which raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on trees, wildlife and rural environment;</li> <li>• Future residential development on land;</li> <li>• The application form and biodiversity questionnaire have not recognised that there were previously trees on the site;</li> <li>• Precedent could be set for other similar pieces of land;</li> <li>• A minimum 5 metre area of re-planting would</li> </ul>	<p>The additional representations received in objection and support is noted. Officers consider that all of the relevant planning issues have been sufficiently covered within the Officer report.</p>

	<p>restore some of the character lost;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why the covenant can not be taken into account is unclear;</li> <li>• It should be noted that only 1 of the supporters are not applicants;</li> <li>• Antisocial behaviour had not been witnessed within the area of trees;</li> <li>• Potential thoroughfare between St Michael's Mead and Thorley.</li> </ul> <p>A representation has been received from No. 21 Penningtons which states that they did not purchase the land to the rear of their property as they wanted the trees and the border between the two housing estates to remain. They comment that the aggressive destruction of these trees is to the detriment of wildlife and the residents of both Penningtons and St Michael's Mead.</p> <p>A representation has been received from Cllr Cutting which raises concerns in respect of this proposal setting a precedent, the approach to tree removal was heavy handed, the land was not trapped but was used by dog walkers etc, the implementation of tree planting in accordance with the Landscape Officers advice should be carried out and should the covenant now be enforced?</p> <p>4 No. letters in support have been received which raise the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The trees were planted to define the outer boundary</li> </ul>	
--	---	--



	<p>of the town, which was no longer needed when the ring road was built;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No objections were raised by Councillors or Officers when they were notified of the sale of the land to extend gardens;</li> <li>• There were no TPO's on the trees;</li> <li>• A line of trees have been left and new ones have been added to fill the gaps.</li> </ul> <p>A representation has been received from a resident in Penningtons which provides a copy of a response from their solicitor and suggest that as the Council no longer owns the land they no longer have any land to 'enjoy' the benefit of the tree covenant and therefore have nothing to protect and enforce. Furthermore, the Council did not maintain the land and allowed the works to take place 18 months ago when they were approached by the land owner.</p>	
<p><b>6d, 3/14/0596/FP Clements Farm, Brickendon</b></p>		<p>The Ordnance Survey (on page 51 of the agenda) is not sufficiently updated as yet to show two other significant agricultural buildings that are also on the farm holding and Members are referred to the Location Plan submitted with the application (copies of which will also be provided to members together with this schedule) which indicates the position of these.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank