

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Extn: 2174
Date: 21 August 2014

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 20 AUGUST 2014

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 – 10)

Yours faithfully,

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

MEETING : DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
VENUE : COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD
DATE : WEDNESDAY 20 AUGUST 2014
TIME : 7.00 PM

This page is intentionally left blank

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 20 August 2014

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>5a 3/13/2223/FP, High Road, High Cross</p>	<p>Hertfordshire County Councils Flood Risk Management <u>Team</u> comments that they have issued consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 for works affecting the ordinary watercourses at North Drive and Cambridge Road, High Cross.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Management Team comments that, with the exception of providing an open channel through the site, the proposed works to the existing watercourses are acceptable. The assessment has concluded that flood risk to the surrounding area should be reduced under all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event and that any residual flood risk from blockage or reduced capacity of the inlet at North Drive should be managed within the new development. The LPA should determine if this residual risk is acceptable and how it is proposed to be managed as this sits outside of the County Councils remit under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991.</p>	<p>Officers note that the Flood Risk Management Team consider that the proposed works to the watercourse to be acceptable in terms of rainfall events including the 1in100 year plus climate change event which is the requirement of the NPPF.</p> <p>Officers consider that the impact associated with residential flood risk within the site to be acceptable – no objections to this have been received from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Officers note the comments in respect of the provision of an open channel within the site – as is set out within the Officer Committee report, the provision of a largely piped system does weigh against the development proposal however, for the reasons set out in detail in paragraphs 7.39-7.45 of the Committee Report, the drainage system as proposed is considered to be acceptable.</p>

	<p><u>Environmental Health</u> have brought to Officers attention their comments in relation to the contaminated land report as submitted with the planning application. There are hotspots of contamination in the trial trenches and there is insufficient detail of remediation in the submitted report. The Environmental Health Team recommends that this is dealt with through a planning condition.</p> <p>A letter from third party in support of the proposed drainage scheme which, it is considered will have a significant positive impact on North Drive.</p> <p>An additional letter from the occupier of The Coach House has been received raising concern that the impact on the amenity of that property has not properly considered or taken into account that the built form of development as shown on the layout plans represents part of the dwellinghouse not outbuildings.</p> <p>No representation – additional comment from Officers</p>	<p>Noted – Officers recommend that an additional planning condition requiring the method of reclamation be specified and a validation report confirming that the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details. Such a condition is considered by Officers to be necessary and reasonable to protect against potential impact on human health.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed development including plots, 17-18 and 19 are located at a minimum of 23 metres and a maximum of 28 metres from the neighbour, The Coach House. Given those distances and the relationships between the proposed development and those neighbours, there will not be a significantly detrimental impact such that would warrant the refusal of planning permission.</p> <p>Submitted with the application is a plan indicating the materials of construction for the proposed dwellings. Officers were anticipating the submission of materials prior to the Committee meeting (as was agreed by the applicant), however, as no samples of materials have been submitted, Officers recommend that an additional condition relating to samples of materials be attached to any resolution from</p>
--	--	--

		Members to grant planning permission.
<p>5c 3/14/0970/RP Land south of Hare Street Road</p>	<p>In response to amended plans, the <u>Landscape Officer</u> recommends consent and comments that the landscape proposals, reinforcement of the tree belt, proposed tree planting, ponds/swales, and management and maintenance plans are acceptable.</p> <p>The Council's <u>Engineer</u> comments that the removal of the smaller northwest pond in favour of improvements to the southwest pond appears reasonable. It would have been possible to retain a smaller capacity pond in the northwest which may have become infrequently wet and would have allowed for enhanced biodiversity, but the amended drawing should be able to provide sufficient good quality drainage and flood risk reduction, and the details seem reasonable.</p> <p>The <u>Environment Agency</u> raise no objection to the amendments and comment that the increase in discharge rate to 5 litres / second is acceptable.</p> <p><u>Buntingford Town Council</u> raise some concerns over the drainage calculations. They comment that in his report, the Inspector required a restricted run off rate of 3.5 litres / second / hectare and this does not appear to be mentioned in the calculations. Also in paragraph 1.1 of the Committee report the site in question, Area 1, is 5.0 hectares. They comment that it is vitally important that the size of the attenuation pond is designed to allow for the</p>	<p>No further comment.</p> <p>No further comment.</p> <p>No further comment</p> <p>The developer's drainage consultant has explained that there is a difference between discharge rates and run-off rates. The discharge rate to the receiving Thames Water sewer is proposed to be restricted to 5 litres / second, but the proposed surface water run-off rates will be in the region of 0.8 litres / second / hectare, which is in accordance with Condition 7, and represents significant</p>

	<p>remainder of the field as rain will still fall there as well as Area 1 and there is no mention of how it is intended to deal with the run off from that.</p> <p>2 further letters of objection have been received making the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed changes make no difference – the development is not needed, the access is ridiculous and the junction floods; • The layout should not enable access to the two new sites; • Boundary tree planting should be permanent and denser; • Inadequate housing for older people; • Footpath 21 must remain accessible at all times; • Hare Street Road will be congested by construction vehicles from the Taylor Wimpey site. 	<p>betterment compared to existing greenfield run-off rates of approximately 3.5 litres / second / hectare. It would not be reasonable to require run-off attenuation for the remainder of the field which in this application is proposed to remain as agricultural land. The reference to 2 hectares relates to the post development impervious catchment, i.e. estimated run off from roofs, roads and hard standings. The total site area is 5 hectares.</p> <p>No further comment.</p>
<p>5d 3/14/0914/FP- Leaside Depot, Ware</p>	<p>The applicant has raised concerns in respect of the requirements of Conditions 10 and 13 for details of the buffer zone to the river and the footpath link to be submitted prior to the commencement of the development.</p>	<p>Officers recommend that these conditions are reworded to make this requirement 'Prior to the commencement of works above ground level (excluding demolition)'. The applicant has agreed to this approach.</p>

	<p>In response to the consultation that has taken place in respect of the amended plans, 5 letters of additional representations have been received from neighbouring residents which raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans show the road through the estate is the proposed exit for all of their service vehicles and visitors; • Concerns are raised in respect of the representation received from County Highways in respect of their comments relating to the use of Paxton Way for vehicles and in respect of the number of parking spaces that are proposed and the impact of these on the existing residents; • A pedestrian crossing is now proposed immediately outside the living and sleeping areas of flats 1 and 2 Marconi Court, generating increased noise and intrusion; • The concerns of the local Constabulary are supported in respect of there being no form of access control for residents with dementia; • The hours of construction work suggested is a concern for shift workers and families with young children; • The care home would put a strain on local doctors surgeries; • Concerns relating to the Engineers comments that the proposal could increase flood risk; • The proposals for replacement trees planting are 	<p>Officers can confirm that the proposal is to use the petrol filling station access to serve the new care home. The proposed site plan has been amended at Officer's request to demonstrate that a pedestrian/cyclist route will remain through the site and into Plaxton Way.</p> <p>The impact of the development, the access and parking provision has adequately dealt with in the Officer report.</p> <p>The pedestrian crossing that has been shown on the amended plans aims to promote pedestrian routes within the area. It is not anticipated that this would lead to unacceptable noise and disturbance to the neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Officers have already responded to the representations received from statutory consultees in respect of boundary treatments, planting/landscape proposals, flood risk and the impact upon local surgeries within the report. Conditions have been recommended to deal with a number of these issues and a financial contribution is sought in respect of the added pressures that the proposal would put on the NHS and local surgeries.</p> <p>The Officers report adequately addresses the issues concerning traffic, parking and highway safety.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>unclear;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume of additional traffic and the potential safety concern caused to the elderly occupiers; • The proposed parking provision is inadequate. 	
5e 3/14/0739/FP Northgate End Bishops Stortford	Two further letters of objection have been received which raise issues already summarised for Members within section 5.0 of the report.	No further comment.
5f 3/14/0926/FP 19A Gypsy Lane Great Amwell	<p>The Council's <u>Environmental Health</u> officer raises no objection to the proposal but requests conditions regarding Land contamination and any piling works.</p> <p>The applicant has written in response to the objections raised by some third parties and comments that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The new dwelling is intended to replace the current two bedroom 'bungalow' on the site and the unsightly garages but the summerhouse 'will stay in place'. ▪ He owns a small commercial vehicle for his business use but it is not loaded/unloaded at the site. ▪ The trees on the site will remain in place ▪ Full turning facilities are available at the front of the 	<p>Officers recommend the addition of two further conditions as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contaminated land survey and remediation (2E33) • Piling works (2E39) – amend to 'any piling'. <p>The majority of these points are already covered within the report. However, the application and submitted plans clearly indicate that the summerhouse is to be demolished and Officers consider that this is necessary and reasonable to ensure the provision of an appropriate amount of amenity space for the new dwelling and to safeguard the spacious character of the surrounding area. A condition is suggested to ensure this.</p>

	<p>property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ There has been no flooding in the higher part of Gypsy Lane in recent times▪ Refuse storage will be situated at the same point as currently <p>In addition two further letters have been received from local residents querying the retention of the summerhouse and the provision of turning facilities within the site.</p>	<p>The summerhouse is referred to above and the provision of a turning area is covered within the report. Conditions 4 and 11 have been suggested to address these two matters.</p>
--	--	---

This page is intentionally left blank