

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Control Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 18 August 2011

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Control Committee  
agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 17 AUGUST 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 17 AUGUST 2011  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Control Committee

### Date: 17 August 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
<b>5a, 3/11/0793/FO Sanville Gardens, Stanstead Abbotts</b>	The plan within the agenda incorrectly shows the boundary of the play area; an amended location plan has therefore been provided.	None
<b>5b (a), 3/11/0824/FP 7- 8 Bluecoats Avenue, Hertford</b>		Condition 2 update – Final plan numbers to read:- 'M950 P0, M910 P3, M900 P6, M901 P7, M902 P4, M930 P3, L500 P3, L110 P5, L130 P5, L100 P7, L101 P6, L102 P4, L200 P8, L201 P8, L202 P7, S800 P1, Sk100 aP1, SK100 bP1, SK100 cP1, 11655BED04'
<b>5c, 3/11/0987 and 3/11/0988, 295 – 297 Stansted Road, Bishop's Stortford</b>	Additional representations have been received in objection raising the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- employment generation claimed may not be realised and should not be given much weight given that the town is economically buoyant;</li> <li>- employment may simply be transferred from elsewhere;</li> <li>- jobs may be taken up by residents from outside the</li> </ul>	

	<p>town;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- traffic will probably be in excess of that claimed and have a greater impact on local roads;</li> <li>- employees will park offsite and exacerbate existing problems;</li> <li>- the operation of the units will cause noise and disruption;</li> <li>- exacerbate existing highway safety problems particularly for the neighbouring occupier;</li> <li>- the consultation event outcome has been portrayed in a falsely supportive light;</li> <li>- unacceptable impact on privacy</li> </ul> <p>The <u>Councils Landscape Officer</u> comments that the proposals are non contentious in highway terms, but suggests the planting of large trees.</p>	
<p><b>5e, 34 Foxley Drive, Bishop's Stortford</b></p>	<p>A neighbour has raised a concern that within the summary of neighbour comments reference is made to No. 120 Foxley Drive which does not exist.</p> <p>A second email was received from this neighbour querying the address once again after the Officers response to the first email and also querying why County Highways have stated that there is sufficient car parking clear of the highway.</p> <p>Officers understand that DC Members have received 8 e-</p>	<p>The reference made to No 120 Foxley Drive is a typo error and should have said 102 Foxley Drive, which is the postal address for the dwelling also known as 'The Lodge'. No. 102 is the address that our system shows and also the address given by this neighbour in their letter.</p> <p>In respect of the second email from this neighbour the County Highways' response is set out in their representation and is further assessed by Officers in paragraph 6.16 of the Committee report.</p>

	<p>mails from nearby residents in objection to the proposal and these raise matters which are listed in para. 5.2 of the report. Additional traffic generation to the site is also referred to by some residents.</p> <p>Officers also understand that the application has also circulated an e-mail to all DC Members in support of the application</p>	<p>These matters are all considered to be covered by the contents of the report.</p>
<p><b>5g, 3/10/1583/OP The former Cock PH, Stocking Pelham</b></p>	<p>The Parish Council confirms that it is fully supportive of the proposed legal conditions which will enable the erection of the PH and two dwellings.</p>	
<p><b>5h, 3/10/1890/FP, 232 Hert'fordbury Road, Hert'fordbury</b></p>	<p>The County Archaeologist has confirmed that they have no comments to make on the amended scheme</p> <p>The Environment Agency have commented that the site is located in a flood zone and therefore surface water management and flood resilience requirements should be met.</p> <p>The Environment Agency also comments that the site has a pond that may be home to Great Crested Newts, a protected species. They recommend leaving an undeveloped buffer zone around the pond to enhance</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Noted. The applicant has submitted information in accordance with the EA standing advice and confirmed that the site is within an area with a 0/1%/1:1000 risk of flooding. No conditions are required in this instance.</p> <p>Noted, and an additional directive is recommended. The house is around 40m from the pond and the development is unlikely to have any impact on any species present there.</p>

	<p>biodiversity.</p>	<p>Directive: Your attention is drawn to the comments of the Environment Agency in its letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> August regarding the possible presence of Great Crested Newts, a protected species, at the site and the recommended provision of an undeveloped buffer zone around the pond.</p>
<p><b>5i, 3/11/0996/RP and 3/11/0997/RP, 65-67 North Road, Hertford</b></p>	<p>An additional neighbour objection has been received upon realisation that the applications are not alternatives, ie 5 houses are proposed in total. Refers to highway concerns and expresses concern regarding ownership of the historic milestone, and whether it can be protected during any development of the site.</p> <p><u>County Highways</u> raise no objection to proposed vehicle access arrangements for two house scheme (0997)</p> <p>In respect of the proposal for 3 houses (0996) <u>County Highways</u> comment that despite amended plans for the access to the three house scheme, the matter of the access to no. 69 remains unaddressed. They recommend the addition of a Grampian condition requiring agreement of appropriate vehicle access.</p>	<p>The milestone is protected by a condition on the outline planning permission. The developer is responsible for its protection during development, regardless of whether it is within their ownership or not.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Officer recommend that a Grampian condition in this respect would not be appropriate as it requires the agreement of a land owner who is not the applicant. Officers are of the view that the proposals can be supported with the deletion of the current condition 3. This would not resolve access issues however for the occupier of no 69. Condition 3 on application 3/11/0996/RP be amended as follows:</p>

	<p>Final plan numbers for 3/11/0996/RP - 30P1, 31P5, 32P1, 33P1, 34P2, 35P2, 36P2, 37P1, 38P1, 39P2, 40</p> <p>Final plan numbers for 3/11/0997/RP - 10P1, 11P3, 12P3, 13P2, 14P1, 15, 16P2, 17, 18</p>	<p>Update condition 2 as necessary</p> <p>Update condition 2 as necessary</p>
<p><b>5j,</b> <b>3/11/1126/AD</b> <b>The Ridgeway</b> <b>Park, Hertford</b></p>	<p>Amended plans have been received which propose a revised siting of the flag and pole approximately 35m to the north. Amended plan numbers 1A and 4.</p> <p><u>Hertford Town Council</u> raise no objection to the proposal.</p>	<p>The revised siting of the flagpole is further away from neighbouring residential properties and adjacent to the fencing of the Sele Farm Community Centre. This reduces the visual impact of the flagpole and is considered to represent an improvement over the original proposal. No further consultations have been carried out given that no third party correspondence has been received, and the flag will be located further away from residential property.</p> <p>No further comment.</p>
<p><b>3/11/1139/FP –</b> <b>Southern</b> <b>Country Park,</b> <b>Bishop’s</b> <b>Stortford</b></p>	<p><u>Bishop’s Stortford Town Council</u> raises no objections to this proposal</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank