Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the Your contact: Peter Mannings

Development Control Committee Extn: 2174

Date: 7 February 2013

cc. All other recipients of the Development Control Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 6 FEBRUARY 2013

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 6 FEBRUARY 2013

TIME : 7.00 PM



East Herts Council: Development Control Committee Date: 6 February 2013

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
5a, 3/12/1934/OP Former brickfields site, Cole Green Way.	 The applicant has submitted the following additional information since the report was compiled: A response to the Council's Landscape Officer's advice A response to Hertford Town Council A Transport Statement in response to County Highways comments. An amended graphics file with artists impressions of the public realm and improved right of way A letter with possible bridge designs for the access crossing over the River Lea. An extract from the Local Plan's Landscape Character Assessment Area 66 (the site area) which confirms there are no open views across the countryside and the development will not alter this situation. An email of support from County Councillor Teresa Heritage, Deputy Executive Member for Health And Adult Care. 	Members are advised that contrary to the original comments of the Council's Landscape Officer, the red line site is not within a registered Wildlife Site. However, Cole Green Way Local Wildlife Site is immediately adjacent to the north and Terrace Wood Local Wildlife Site lies 80m to the south west. County Highways have responded to the submission of the Transport Statement (TS) which includes projected trip generation figures. They state that the likely trip generation figures would be considerably higher than those projected in the TS and until agreement is reached with County Highways on the likely numbers, any further analysis on the junction capacity is meaningless. Concern remains regarding the safety of the junction off Horns Mill Road and in the applicant's analysis of the sustainable transport network in the

5a, 3/12/1934/OI Former brickfields				
-:441-1				
site, cont'd				

vicinity of the site.

A significant amount of additional information has since been received today (6th Feb) and this is currently being reviewed by County Highways. An initial review indicates that the information has focussed on trip generation calculations and therefore has sought to address one of the concerns raised. However, there remains other highway related concerns that appear not to have been addressed and, given the late stage of these submissions, Officers are content that the recommended reason for refusal should remain.

In addressing refusal reason 4 relating to the proposed access bridge, the applicants have supplied photos of possible bridge styles. However, no detailed designs have been submitted that demonstrate that the bridge would not cause an increase in flood risk or be comfortably accommodated within the red line site. As such, the information does not satisfactorily address the reason for refusal, in Officers view.

The email from County Councillor Heritage outlines broad support for flexicare schemes without specifically mentioning the application. Officers are content that the benefits of the scheme are outlined in the report.

5a,

Former

brickfields

3/12/1934/OP

Officers are content that the point raised in relation

to the identified Landscape Character Assessment – that the site provides no open views across the

countryside – is adequately addressed in the report.

site, cont'd	10 further neighbour representations received which raise similar concerns to those raised previously and are addressed the report.	
	Officers also understand that the applicant has written to Members, in a letter dated 16 January 2013, setting out the benefits of the proposal and the difficulties finding suitable sites for the particular form of development.	No changes to the recommendation are suggested.
5b, 3/12/1632/FO Hertford Police Station, Ware Road	The agent has raised a concern that the application type, as listed at the start of the report refers to a 'Full – Major' application rather than a Section 73 application to vary a condition of the existing planning consent.	For the avoidance of doubt, this is a s.73 application which seeks to carry out the development without complying with the details of condition 2 (the Approved Plans condition). The effect of the permission in this case would be to permit minor material amendments to the development as identified in the report.
	The Councils solicitor has sought clarification as to the details of the proposed s.106 variation	The variation referred to in the recommendation would be to require that the same obligations as contained in the approved s.106 agreement apply equally to this amended scheme.

5b, 3/12/1632/FO Hertford Police Station Cont'd	One further letter of objection has been received which reiterates a previously stated view that the proposed hotel would be too close to a primary school.	Members are reminded that this proposal seeks only to amend the approved plans in respect of the residential elements of the scheme and does not affect the approved hotel or nursing home.
5e, 3/12/1860/FP Firlands, Bishops Stortford	In response to the submitted parking survey, County Highways have commented that this appears to overestimate the spaces available in the area, as it allows for parking on the bends at Firlands, However, they state their earlier comments (with regard to alternative provision, as set out in para.3.5 of the report) still stand.	No change to recommendation.