

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Control Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 10 March 2011

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Control Committee  
agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 9 MARCH 2011**

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 CONTROL COMMITTEE  
**VENUE** : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD  
**DATE** : WEDNESDAY 9 MARCH 2011  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Control Committee

**Date: 9 March 2011**

**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>5a), 3/10/2047/FO Former McMullens Brewery, Hartham Lane, Hertford</b></p>	<p>Hertford Town Council has objected that the amended café increases its size by 40 sqm, a substantial amount which promotes the development as a one stop shop jeopardising the vitality and viability of the town centre. It should remain in the listed building as originally approved providing a high degree of access and use by the public. The copper hopback should be replaced.</p> <p>They are disappointed that windows W647 and 648 replace the shutters with double glazed units. Double glazed units would be a poor reminder of modern day changes, completely out of place and spoil the elevation. They wish to see smaller windows which replicate the metal frame pattern of other windows. They object to wider infilling of existing windows and closing of others</p>	<p>Noted but officers do not consider the additional floor area will have any discernible impact on the town centre. The Secretary of State considered the development would bring overall benefit to the town centre. It is considered that the amended details are an overall improvement of the scheme and linkage between the store and brewery.</p> <p>The double glazing windows are being proposed only for the larger windows to strengthen a single large pane window and improve energy efficiency. This larger window can light the internal space without need for other openings that may require loss of fabric. The frame proposed will not reflect those of standard double glazed windows and reflect in part the evolution of the building's design, an argument which the Conservation Officer has agreed with. Other changes are necessitated by the need to comply with fire regulations or provide satisfactory internal daylight</p>

	<p>Sainsbury's have confirmed that they intend to implement this amended scheme if approved.</p> <p>They have asked for amendments to the proposed wording of conditions 7, 10, 11, 29, 35, 38. One parking space would be lost due to the provision of a pedestrian link in the main car park.</p> <p>Para 3.2. They do not wish to provide a miniature replica of the hopback which they believe would be false and out of place.</p> <p>Para 8.2. Report should clarify that the two fermenting vessels are retained within the interpretation centre and in the first floor meeting room.</p> <p>Sainsbury's Conservation Adviser has explained the benefit of the larger windows in WG47 and WG48 and the need for making changes to windows to provide additional daylight and to comply with fire regulations. Brick infilling is done to retain the feature within the walls. The principles that govern the work are to make changes essential for the new use of the building but do not detract from its significance.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>There is scope for minor word changing to reflect the changing circumstances for submission of details. The loss of a single space results in 231 spaces overall, as it enables a required pedestrian link it is acceptable for this reason. It is recommended the precise wording amendments be delegated to the Director of Neighbourhood Services for agreement with the Chairman of the Development Control Committee.</p> <p>Noted. This is an ongoing discussion; the details of the interpretation centre are ultimately to be agreed via the proposed planning condition 37.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. This is the location of the two vessels.</p> <p>Noted and accepted by the Conservation Officer.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>The Conservation Officer recommends approval of the application having regard to the recent amended plans. Relocating the exhibition centre and café is a sensitive response to the loss of the hopback. The approach to windows WG47 and WG48 is acceptable in accordance with conservation principles of allowing evolution and honesty.</p>	<p>Noted. The plan amendments follow negotiations on appropriate changes with the Conservation Officer.</p>
<p><b>5b)</b> <b>3/10/1295/FN</b> <b>Richard Hale</b> <b>School</b></p>	<p>Following the drafting of the report, Officers wish to recommend an additional condition to ensure the provision of the shared community use.</p>	<p>Suggested condition would read:-</p> <p><i>Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, details of the arrangements for the building's shared use by the community including public access at weekends and evenings, shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The use of the building shall thereafter continue in accordance with the approved scheme unless as otherwise may be varied and approved in writing by the local planning authority.</i></p> <p><i>Reason:</i></p> <p><i>To ensure the provision of the building responds to the opportunity to provide for shared community use and in accordance with Policy LRC2 of the adopted East Herts Local Plan 2007.</i></p>

<p><b>5c)</b> <b>3/10/1200/FP</b> <b>Tewinbury Farm,</b> <b>Hertford Road,</b> <b>Tewin</b></p>	<p>Officers understand that the applicant, Mr V Williams and his agent, Ms J Molyneux have circulated e-mails and accompanying letters to all DC Members dated respectively 5 and 4 March 2011. Three further supporting letters have also been circulated.</p>	
<p><b>5d)</b> <b>3/10/1583/OP</b> <b>The former Cock PH,</b> <b>Stocking Pelham</b></p>	<p>Officers understand that the planning agent, Mr C Barker has circulated a letter to all DC Members dated 4 March 2011. This contained a commentary on build prices that officers have independently been asked to bring to the attention of members.</p> <p>It is also understood that Mr M Hutchins on behalf of the Parish Council has circulated a supporting statement to Members dated 8 March 2011.</p> <p>One further representation has been received in support of and one in objection to the proposals. The objector is concerned that the size of the site is not sufficient and that the pub, if built, would be converted to residential.</p>	
<p><b>5e)</b> <b>3/11/0079/FP</b> <b>Monks Green Farm,</b> <b>Brickendon</b></p>	<p>Brickendon Liberty PC raise objections. They comment that 'traffic associated with chicken farming in the sheds to be converted ceased 3 years ago when the previous application 3/08/1739/FP was lodged'. They comment that 'from no traffic movements now, to an estimated 4000 [their estimate] plus journeys on Mangrove Lane is not a reduction.</p>	<p>The use of the site for chicken rearing has not creased. At the time of the Officer's site visit, young chickens were housed in the sheds.</p> <p>Officers consider that the amount of traffic generated by the 6 live/work units would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding highway</p>

	They refer to an appeal at land adjacent to Highfield Farm, Mangrove Lane wherein highway movements on Mangrove Lane were an issue is dismissal.	network and would result in a reduction of larger farm vehicles travelling to and from the site. The Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal on highway safety or capacity grounds and furthermore, no objections were raised on these grounds previously. Officers do not therefore consider that a refusal on these grounds is justified.
<b>5f) 3/10/2154/FP Birch Farm Kennels, White Stubbs Lane</b>	<p>Officers understand that the applicant's agent has circulated an e-mail/letter to all DC Members dated 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2011.</p> <p>Officers also understand that the adjoining resident and land owner has circulated an e-mail to some DC Members dated 8 March 2011 clarifying that he is not connected with the proposal other than the applicant has a right of way over his land. He further comments that to have 34 unstaffed kennels open on a 24 hour basis would be 'untenable'</p>	This correspondence raises no new issues.
<b>5i) 3/11/0104/FN 18 Chantry Road, Bishop's Stortford</b>	Bishops Stortford Town Council have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal.	
<b>5j) 3/10/2177/FP Scholars Hill House</b>	Following the drafting of the report, Officers wish to recommend an amendment to condition 2.	<p>Condition to be amended to read:-</p> <p><i>Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of the proposed means of</i></p>

		<p><i>disposal of the excavated spoil from the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the soil disposal shall be carried out in accordance with those approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing..</i></p> <p><i>Reason: As set out in the report</i></p>
<p><b>5m)</b> <b>E/10/0095/A</b> <b>1 Henderson</b> <b>Place</b></p>	<p>The owners' agent has written to state that his client is considering making an appeal against the earlier refusal of planning permission and therefore he considers that enforcement action would be premature at this stage.</p>	<p>No appeal has yet been lodged and therefore Officers consider that there should be no change to the current recommendation. It may then be possible for a joint appeal to be held in respect of both the refusal of permission and against the enforcement notice.</p>