

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Control Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 24 May 2012

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Control Committee  
agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 23 MAY 2012**

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 23 MAY 2012  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Control Committee

### Date: 23 May 2012

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, 3/11/2209/FP , Pentlows Farm, Braughing</b></p>	<p>The Councils Solicitor has commented that reference to 30% intermediate affordable housing on page 13 of the Committee Report should make reference to shared ownership.</p> <p>The Councils Solicitor has also commented that there is insufficient information relating to the transfer of land between the developer and the Parish Council and further information in respect of this matter, including how the land will be used and maintenance contributions, should be submitted in order for the S106 to be properly drafted.</p> <p>The Councils Solicitor has also commented that further information relating to the maintenance</p>	<p>Re paragraph 7.49 of the Report: that the applicant has confirmed a willingness to meet the contributions as set out in the Committee Report. This includes a higher contribution of £7841 towards Children and Young People.</p> <p>Noted, reference to intermediate housing on page 13 of the report replaced with shared ownership.</p> <p>Officers understand that the developer has discussed with the Parish Council the</p>

	<p>costs associated with the balancing pond, future landscaped areas and private access road should be submitted in order for the S106 to be properly drafted.</p> <p>The <u>Historic Environment Unit</u> comments that the pasture land to the west of the application site contains heritage assets of archaeological and historic interest. On part of the level ground on the site are some slight earthworks that form a rectangular platform which is probably the site of a former building which, since it does not appear on any earlier maps, is likely to be of early post medieval or earlier date.</p> <p>The construction of the balancing pond will destroy most, if not all, of this 'house platform' and probably also a proportion of the field boundary/probable Roman Road.</p> <p>The position of the proposed development is such that it should be regarded as likely to have an impact on heritage assets for which provision</p>	<p>transfer of land to it and subsequent maintenance by it. A fallback position will need to be identified in any legal agreement should the Parish Council not ultimately be minded to take on the ownership and maintenance of the land.</p> <p>Noted – the Council have recommended an archaeological condition – condition 4, page 14.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>should be made via an archaeological condition. All areas of the development that will be subject to excavation, re-grading or other landscaping works that will have an impact should be subject to archaeological evaluation via 'strip, map and record'.</p> <p>The Councils <u>Landscape Officer</u> has commented that the general layout allows for gardens of reasonable proportion for the sizes of plots. The amenity open space on the eastern side of the development together with balancing pond is a welcome landscape feature of the development. The internal arrangement of open space is at risk of appearing overly car dominated – comprising mostly of access road and parking provision with not much soft landscaping potential, although the generous open space provision to the east compensates in full for this. Given that the frontage to dwellings or “street scene” is to comprise mostly of hard surface, particular care must be taken when considering both soft and hard landscape design details.</p> <p>The Landscape Officer recommends that hard and</p>	<p>Noted, Officers have recommended a landscape condition.</p> <p>Officers note the concerns of the PC. It is</p>
--	---	---

	<p>soft landscaping be agreed through the provision of a planning condition.</p> <p><u>Braughing Parish Council</u> has indicated that it is very disappointed that, in transferring the land to the west of the development to the Parish Council, the applicant is making no financial contribution to outdoor sports facilities. The PC notes that the relocation of the balancing pond (through plan amendments) has reduced its ability to extend the churchyard.</p> <p>Other points are made in the PC letter in relation to the legal agreement financial contributions. These are covered in the points set out above.</p> <p>A copy of a letter from a local resident to the MP has been received. This is in objection to the proposals.</p>	<p>considered that a financial contribution for outdoor sports facilities should not be sought because there is no identified deficiency in the village and because of the alternative benefit of the provision of the land. The balancing pond location is determined by the configuration of the land and the need for it to operate effectively.</p> <p>The points raised are addressed in the report.</p>
<p><b>5b, 3/12/0314/FP Haileybury College, Hertford</b></p>	<p>The applicants agent has confirmed that the school wish to use the synthetic turf pitch and floodlights for the same times as permitted for the existing pitch – 9am to 10pm daily</p>	<p>Noted and can be considered under the details required by condition 6.</p>

<b>Heath</b>		
<b>5c, 3/12/0427/FP and 3/12/0428/L C, Former Waters Garage site, North Road, Hertford</b>	Both applications <u>WITHDRAWN</u>	
<b>5n E/11/0403/A Units 5a and 5b Hadham Industrial Estate, Little Hadham</b>	A letter from the owner of the site has been received commenting on a 'standard letter' advising him that the matter would be referred to the DC Committee. The owner considers that they have sought to take action to rectify the breach of planning control and that they would be happy to set out the full details of the action taken and have it put to the DC Committee, which is where he considers the application [3/12/2012/FP] should have been determined.	Officers consider that the actions to which the owner refers relate to the retrospective application reference 3/12/0210/FP, submitted on the 6 <sup>th</sup> February 2012, seeking planning permission for a change of use of these units. This application was refused under delegated powers as detailed within the report at paragraph 1.5.  No change to the report is recommended

This page is intentionally left blank