## **Public Document Pack**



Chairman and Members of the Your contact: Peter Mannings

Development Control Committee Extn: 2174

Date: 10 November 2011

cc. All other recipients of the Development Control Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 9 NOVEMBER 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 – 6)

Yours faithfully,

Peter Mannings
Democratic Services Officer
East Herts Council
peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk

**MEETING**: DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

**VENUE**: COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD

DATE: WEDNESDAY 9 NOVEMBER 2011

**TIME** : 7.00 PM



## **East Herts Council: Development Control Committee Date: 9 November 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	
5c, 3/11/1492/FP Palletts Wood, Oaks Cross Farm, Hooks	The Council's Landscape Officer has objected to the proposal on the grounds that insufficient evidence has been provided to show that the scheme would not be harmful to the trees of Palletts Wood.	Refusal reason no 4 deals with this issue.	
Cross	He comments that the arboricultural report notes that the full impact of the proposed structures could not be fully assessed as the exact layout was not available at the time of the survey.		
	He also notes that the majority of trees surveyed were categorised as those of highest value.		
	He concludes that the development is not environmentally responsible in terms of its impact on trees.		
	The County Highways Officer has commented that an additional land ownership plan, provided by the applicant, indicates that vehicle access to the site via the Oaks Cross Farm site entrance onto the A602 would be acceptable in principle. In the event of permission being granted, a	Noted. It is recommended that refusal reason no 3 is deleted.	

	Grampian condition is recommended to ensure that the full details of the vehicle access would be acceptable.	
5d, 3/11/0236/SV Former TXU Site, Mead Lane, Hertford	The applicant writes to advise the payment of £4,000 plus indexation, amounting to £5,556 in total has been sent by way of cheque to HCC. The recommendation in the report refers to the sum due in respect of the approval of the 8 new parking spaces for Elder Court, which was previously considered alongside this application and not in order to justify the omission of the car club. The recommendation now need not include the provision of a financial contribution.  Herts Highways have confirmed receipt of the payment £5,556.00 in respect of the Car Club Contribution under clause 5.1.2 of the Unilateral Undertaking dated 29/07/2011	The obligation to provide £4000 by a S106 contribution should be deleted as this has been provided for in the approved planning permission (3/11/0217/FP). Payment confirmed by HCC.  The provision of this sum is part of the overall considerations for no longer requiring the car club element in the S106.
	A Hertford Town Councillor has requested further information with regard to the progress achieved during the deferral of the matter. He suggests that the developer could offer to make Spencer Street up to adoptable standard as this would assist those who have suffered as a result of the development.	Comments are noted but it is considered that the matter is covered in the report.
5h 3/11/1448/FP Little Orchard,	In relation to the highway safety issue, the applicant has sought Counsel advice indicating that the Highway	In terms of the proposed condition requested by the applicant, Officers do not consider that this would

τ	
Ø	
g	
Φ	
5	

Aston	Authority has appropriate powers to secure enhanced	meet the appropriate
	visibility. The applicant has met with Herts Highways	control of the hedge
	Officers on site to discuss visibility and established that the	unclear (it either rests
	face of the hedge line needs to be trimmed back a	or with the original
	marginal amount for a distance of 35m from the centre of	There is no clear pro
	the private drive/ Aston End Road junction.	achieved and therefor
		not considered approp
	The applicant requests that a condition be imposed on any	
	approval to adhere to the sightline requirement.	

meet the appropriate tests. The ownership and control of the hedge which requires trimming is unclear (it either rests with the adjacent householder or with the original St Marys Close developer). There is no clear prospect that the works can be achieved and therefore a condition to require this is not considered appropriate.

This page is intentionally left blank