

# Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the  
Development Control Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings  
Extn: 2174  
Date: 28 February 2013

cc. All other recipients of the  
Development Control Committee  
agenda

Dear Councillor,

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 27 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 – 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 27 FEBRUARY 2013  
**TIME** : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

## East Herts Council: Development Control Committee

### Date: 27 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  |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>5a,<br/>3/12/2019/FP,<br/>Amwell View<br/>School<br/>Stanstead<br/>Abbotts</b></p> | <p>Councillor G Williamson has written in support of the application, stating that the school “provides an incredible service to children with extreme special needs and that the new facility will bring them real benefits. I don’t believe that under our planning policies it would cause any offence”.</p> <p>An adjacent occupier to the south of the site has written to highlight their concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposal represents an ongoing overdevelopment of the site,</li> <li>• the removal of an oak tree and replacement with the development is inappropriate</li> <li>• whilst supporting the work of the school, they feel that it must be more accountable for its duty of care to neighbours and that of the Grade II listed St Margaretsbury House.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 7.11 of the report incorrectly states that St Margaretsbury House is the closest facing property to the extension.</p> | <p>These issues are addressed in the report.</p> <p>St Margaretsbury House is almost a hundred metres from the location of the extension and , given the extent of separation, and the presence of a number of existing school buildings between the extension and main listed building, officers do not consider that the development would have a unacceptable material impact on its setting.</p> <p>Officers confirm that number 1 Lakes Court is the closest property facing the proposed development, at around 70 metres from the site of the extension.</p> |

|  |   |                                    |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>5b,<br/>3/12/2013/FP,<br/>Brook Cottage<br/>Furneaux<br/>Pelham</b> | <p>The <u>Landscape Officer</u> has provided further comments with regard to the proposed entrance to the site, specifically with regard to the positioning of the visibility splays and the loss of landscaping/hedges. In summary the Officer retains their previous recommendation that landscape conditions can be attached to cover hard landscape materials and specifications for the stable yard, access road/track and parking area with the suggestion that the parking area is set back slightly further from the road but in addition that replacement hedge planting (to screen an informal parking area e.g.) is secured if possible.</p> | No additional comments             |
|  | <p>The Applicant has submitted 9 e-mails/letters of support for the application from local residents. They have also submitted a letter from the Riding for the Disabled Association which supports the application. Furthermore, they have submitted an e-mail from a member of Furneaux Pelham Parish Council. This indicates that, following debate at the parish council meeting it was delegated to the clerk to draw together a letter of response. The Councillor indicates that he could see no planning grounds of objection.</p>  | No additional comments             |
|  | <p>Para. 5.2 of the Committee report states that 5 letters of objection have been received. This should however state that 4 letters of objection have been received.</p>   | Correction to wording at para. 5.2 |
|  | <p>It is recommended that a condition is added to the recommendation requiring details of any external lighting</p>   | Additional condition               |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | proposed to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (Lighting Details 2E27).   |   |
| <b>5c,<br/>3/12/1417/RP<br/>Longmead,<br/>Buntingford</b>                     | Two additional letters of objection have been received which express concern that the layout is at variance from that approved under the outline application and that landscaping has been excluded from the proposal  |   |
| <b>5d,<br/>3/11/1355/FP,<br/>White Lion<br/>House<br/>Furneaux<br/>Pelham</b> | <p>Cllr Carver has commented that having been approached and having been involved in this case over many years and <u>although clearly not the local member</u>, he would like his comments recorded as far as the latest application is concerned and that he continues to believe that this is an inappropriate development in this sensitive conservation area and that the proximity to the listed building, The White Lion will have a significant detrimental impact.</p> <p>An agent on behalf of the applicant confirms that design of the foundations will not affect the ridge line of the dwelling. If any alteration is required will be accommodated in an amendment to the rear lean to.</p> <p>Officers understand that the Church End Conservation Group has circulated a letter to all DC Members dated 15 February 2013.</p> <p>The <u>Councils Solicitor</u> suggests the need for further conditions restricting permitted development rights due to</p> | <p>The points raised are noted, however it is considered that the impact of the proposed development is overplayed in the submission and that the proposals remain acceptable.</p> <p>A further condition of this nature is not considered necessary as the tree remains protected by virtue of</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | potential damage to the adjacent tree due to the exercise of these rights.  | its Conservation Area location.  |
| <b>5e<br/>3/12/1150/FP<br/>Grass Warren,<br/>Tewin</b>              | <p>The Parish Council refers to the land included within the application site. It also comments that not all trees shown to be retained on the arboricultural report plans are similarly shown on the site layout plans. Lastly, it asks for clarification with regard to the boundary treatment to the south of the site.</p> <p>A further comment has been received from an assumed resident (by e-mail with no address). This is in objection in relation to the loss of the current green space in Grass Warren. Suggests that protected animal species may be present in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>The <u>Councils Solicitor</u> suggests a further condition be applied restricting the occupation of the dwellings (other than the intended open market dwelling) other than as affordable dwellings.</p> | <p>The amended red line incorporates the land to which the proposals relate. Not all trees are shown on the layout plans, some are beyond the site boundary. Those to the east boundary are modest and it is considered that replacement planting here is acceptable.</p> <p>With regard to boundary treatment, a condition has been applied which will require final details to be clarified.</p> <p>There has been no previous information to suggest that protected animal species are present on the site or at risk of harm as a result of the development proposals.</p> <p>A further condition can be applied as suggested.</p> |
| <b>5I,<br/>E/12/0240/B<br/>Madgeways<br/>Lane, Great<br/>Amwell</b> | The site owner has written to advise Officers that consent was not required under the Hedgerows Regulations for the removal of the hedgerow, and that the consent of the Highway Authority was obtained for the crossover.  | The owner's comments are noted. However, for the reasons set out in the report, Officers remain of the view that the works constitute an engineering operation and have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | They argue that the works do not constitute an engineering operation and therefore do not require planning permission. | No change to the recommendation is suggested. |
|--|--|---|

This page is intentionally left blank